# The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 17, 1920 No. 2846


## Contents


EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS ..... 61

EDITORIALS:

- Sowing the Wind to Reap the Whirlwind ..... 64
- Food and Finance ..... 65
- Whom the Gods Would Destroy ..... 66
- The German War Inquiry ..... 66
- Subways and Soviets ..... 67

ORDEAL BY DINNER. By Oswald Garrison Villard ..... 68

AMERICAN IMITATIONS OF JAPANESE POETRY. By Torao Taketomo 70

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE:

- I. The Strangling of Austria. By William MacDonald ..... 72
- II. The Scrapping of the Cabinet. By Herbert W. Horwill ..... 73

THE WINTER GARDEN. By Frederick Peterson ..... 75

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter ..... 75

LITERATURE:

- Vacancies and Vagaries ..... 76
- Religion and Culture ..... 77
- Minor Playwrights ..... 78

BOOKS IN BRIEF ..... 79

DRAMA:

- Toward a People's Theatre. By Ludwig Lewisohn ..... 80

ART: Illustration in Rapid Survey. By N. N. ..... 82

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION ..... 83

BOOKS OF THE WEEK ..... 91



PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor — HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ARTHUR WARNER, Associate Editors — FREDA KIRCHWEY, MABEL H. B. MUSSEY

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, NEW YORK. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.


THE results of the Spen Valley by-election in England, announced on January 3, brought to an unexpected close a unique campaign. The pre-election battle, in the press and from the soap-box at least, was chiefly between Sir John Simon, the Liberal candidate and former Cabinet member, and Lieutenant Colonel B. C. Fairfax, the Coalition candidate. Endorsements from generals and Ministers were freely employed by both sides, personalities were invoked, Liberal associations literally by the dozen supported Sir John and roundly denounced Mr. Lloyd George for his support of the Coalition candidate; and then, when the vote was taken and the poll declared, the seat was discovered to have gone to Mr. Tom Myers, candidate of the Labor party. The result is of double significance. In the first place, as Sir John Simon said during the campaign, "this by-election has by common consent become an important political event, not because of any personal question, but because it is a test of the country's view of the Coalition Government and the Coalition system twelve months after the general election." In the second place, it was a test of the vitality and promise of the Liberals as a party of opposition. The Coalition was rebuked, as the Liberals predicted it would be; but the Liberals, too, were rebuked and the Labor candidate, who a year ago was defeated by an adverse vote of more than 2,000, increased his support by over 3,000 votes and outdistanced his Coalition opponent by some 3,800 and Sir John Simon by nearly 2,000. Not only have Labor and the forces of liberalism shown emphatically their distrust of Mr. Lloyd George, but the National Unionist Association adopted resolutions condemning the Prime Minister's Manchester speech. The Premier is, in fact, a Minister without a party, and only complete confusion in the ranks of the opposition is likely to save the coming elections for the Coalition.

THE whole of the past year has been, for Spain, a time of great political and industrial unrest. According to the Madrid journal *El Mundo*, there have been ten political crises, with forty-four Ministers and four complete changes of Government. The present Cabinet, headed by Señor Allende Salazar, is much more conservative than the De Toca Ministry which preceded it, and on that account appears to be extremely unpopular with the liberal and radical elements. Unless it can count on undivided Conservative support it is unlikely to last long, particularly in the face of its failure to deal with the grave labor disturbance which is paralyzing the country. The labor situation has grown steadily worse since the March strikes, notwithstanding the fact that an eight-hour law went into effect on October 1, and that on October 11 a royal decree provided for the creation of a Commission of Labor, composed of an equal number of workers and employers, to settle industrial disputes in Catalonia, where the labor difficulty is most serious. The general lockout, begun in Catalonia on November 3, settled on November 12 by a compromise between employers and employees, and renewed on December 3 on the ground that the unions had not complied with the terms of the agreement, has now extended to other provinces and has been attended by numerous outbreaks of violence. That it is nevertheless succeeding in its purpose of destroying the power of the syndicates might perhaps be inferred from the report that the rank and file of the Catalonian syndicalists are turning against their leaders. The leaders of the workmen, on their part, are being openly accused of embezzling strike funds. On January 7 the Civil Governor of Barcelona was reported to have suppressed the syndicalist associations in that city, and to have arrested 100 of the leaders. Similar efforts at suppression are on foot in other cities, accompanied by proposals to outlaw all such associations. Considering the strength of the Spanish labor unions, it is unlikely that such drastic plans can be carried out without arousing violent, and perhaps revolutionary, opposition.

CANADA, like the rest of the world, is disturbed by the mutterings of political and economic unrest. Sir Robert Borden's extended leave of absence probably wards off for a few months the inevitable Dominion election, but the recent changes in the Ministry do not strengthen the Government. The Unionist party is discredited; the Liberals, even under the able leadership of Mr. Mackenzie King, find themselves between the devil of reaction and the deep sea of excessive radicalism; while the Farmers, who scored so signal a victory in the provincial elections last fall, are apparently gaining ground under the leader-


LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship of Mr. T. A. Crerar, formerly Minister of Agriculture and a coming man in Dominion politics. Mr. Crerar, like Premier Drury of Ontario, is an uncompromising advocate of free trade; the Farmers' platform substitutes for protection direct taxation and income and inheritance taxes. In addition to the steadily increasing Farmer vote, the Labor party is now a force to be reckoned with. In the recent Winnipeg election, although the Citizens' League claimed a sweeping victory over "Bolshevism," meaning the Labor party, the Labor candidate for Mayor polled nearly three times as many votes as last year, and the City Council is about evenly divided between Labor and "loyal citizens." Even the formation of a new Government, however, will not at once end Canada's troubles. The political differences which have long made the Province of Quebec a tender spot in the Dominion are still sharp; the exchange situation is bad, and industrial unrest is prevalent everywhere. It will be interesting to see whether Mr. Mackenzie King's political tour of the Provinces will revive the Liberal strength that of late has been declining.

THE trial of R. B. Russell for seditious conspiracy in connection with the general strike in Winnipeg last May and June has resulted in conviction and a two years' s ntence of imprisonment, despite the fact that the case for the prosecution was so weak as to require on several occasions the moral support of the Dominion Government in the form of visits to Winnipeg by Senator Robertson. The evidence indicates that the fundamental issue was not seditious conspiracy at all, but socialism. To a farmer jury there were presented for the first time, as a part of Russell's testimony, the time-honored doctrines of socialism, and it was these that apparently had weight with the jury. It was incumbent upon the Crown to prove its charge of seditious conspiracy in the general strike; instead, it spent valuable time in proving that there had been a strike and that many people had been greatly inconvenienced thereby. The defense freely conceded both of these contentions, but denied that the general strike was unlawful. From the beginning the case was mainly one of fact *versus* emotion. On the one side were "law and order," horror at the suggestion of a change in the existing form of government, and a suffering public deprived of its milk and eggs; on the other, evidence showing that a large majority of the workers had voted for the strike, that after the first excitement was over every effort was made by the strike committee to preserve order and occasion as little suffering as possible, and the denial by the strike committee of any attempt on its part to establish at Winnipeg a soviet form of government. But Mr. Russell was a Socialist, and socialism, as presented by the Crown lawyers, was evidently too much for the jury. The friends of Mr. Russell and of labor generally are hopeful that the appeal which has been taken will be sustained.

THE charges brought by the Socialist members of the New York Assembly against the Lusk Committee are far too grave to be disposed of by Senator Lusk and Mr. Stevenson with mere denials and expressions of contempt. The Committee is charged with the serious offense of furthering the commercial designs of a foreign Government at the expense of the rights and liberties of American citizens. It is charged with having taken counsel with a certain Mr. R. N. Nathan, chief of the British Secret Service in the United States, concerning raids on the Russian Soviet Bureau and the Rand School. The Committee is further charged with having allowed Mr. Nathan to inspect all the documents seized from the offices of the Soviet Bureau, including copies of correspondence and tentative contracts between the representatives of the Soviet Government and certain of the largest manufacturing firms in the United States. Mr. Nathan, it is asserted, was even permitted to take into the permanent possession of the British Government photostat copies of all the documents in question. The gravity of these charges is increased by the fact that, shortly after he is alleged to have received this important material, Mr. Nathan left for England; and, according to a statement by Mr. Harmsworth, Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, made in the House of Commons on December 8, Mr. Nathan has been acting as private secretary to Mr. O'Grady in the conferences at Copenhagen with M. Litvinov, the representative of the Russian Government. The recently-reported financial wardship of Great Britain over the Baltic states, and the persistent rumors of a coming commercial arrangement between Great Britain and the Russian Government, emphasize the need of an immediate inquiry into the charges of the Socialist Assemblymen. Any reported connection, financial or other, between an agent of a foreign Government and a committee of an American State Legislature, demands an immediate investigation at the hands of Congress as well as by the State itself.

THE executive committee of the American Bar Association has been taking by post card a referendum vote of its members on a resolution which declares that "Whereas the Constitution of the United States and the Constitutions of the several States contemplate government by and for all the people and not by or for any particular class, group, or interest," "the liberties of the people and the preservation of their institutions depend upon the control and exercise by the Federal, State, and municipal governments of whatever force is necessary to maintain at all hazards the supremacy of the law and to suppress disorder and punish crime." It would be interesting to know what is back of this resolution. On its face the declaration which it embodies would seem to be superfluous, since the Federal, State, and municipal governments already possess, theoretically if not in actual fact, all the force necessary to uphold the law, suppress disorder, and punish crime. If, on the other hand, the submission of the resolution is designed as a test of loyalty, one need only recall that every member of the bar in the United States, whether a member of the Association or not, has taken an oath to support and defend the Government of the United States and of the State in which he practices. Why, one wonders, is a great professional organization like the American Bar Association calling upon its members to assert the obvious? The resolution, the mere reading of which is enough to arouse suspicion as to the motive behind it, is in sharp contrast with a recent report of the State Bar Association of New York, in which the course of the Government in the prosecution of certain persons accused of pro-German activities, notably Dr. E. A. Rumely, is sharply criticized.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S letter, read at the Jackson Day dinner at Washington on January 8, is a curious jumble. It begins with a direct attack upon the Senate for having sacrificed, by its failure to ratify the treaty with Germany, the "spiritual leadership of the world" which the United

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States until that moment had enjoyed. Without the treaty and the League, the world is back at its old starting-point as before the war, with a prospect of offensive and defensive alliances, plots and intrigues, and spies and secret treaties galore. Mr. Wilson himself, however, runs true to form. He is for the treaty, the whole treaty, and nothing but the treaty; and his conviction that the overwhelming majority of the country wants all this, too, is strengthened by "the unmistakable evidences of public opinion" which were afforded by his recent speechmaking tour through seventeen States—a tour which, by the way, ended more than three and a half months ago. The most that he will allow the recreant Senate to do is to adopt "interpretations" which will "say what the undoubted meaning of the League is"; but as we must take the treaty "without changes which alter its meaning," there seems little likelihood of agreement so long as the Senate thinks that the League covenant means one thing and the President thinks that it means another. Then, having washed his hands of the Senate, asserted his own conviction of what the people want, and branded a new and separate peace with Germany as an "unthinkable task," he proposes to continue the present chaos for some ten months by letting the voters hold "a great and solemn referendum" on the treaty at the November election. The inference presumably is that if the vote is favorable, "spiritual leadership" will have been recovered. Meantime, the world having been made safe for democracy —it is Mr. Wilson who repeats the phrase—we should turn our attention to the final vindication of democracy, which the President admits has not yet been achieved; doing so, as he reminds us, with the character and example of Andrew Jackson before our eyes. One puts down the letter with a feeling of uncertainty as to whether Mr. Wilson is really abdicating leadership in favor of the people, or whether he is only making a shrewd bid for a third term.

THE House of Representatives has again joined in the game of making additional Socialists and increasing the popular unrest by once more refusing a seat to Mr. Victor L. Berger on the ground of his "disloyalty" during the war. Just what would happen to that contention if the Circuit Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court should differ from Judge Landis is an interesting speculation. At present it is sufficient to observe that 24,000 American citizens voted for Mr. Berger, and that a highly dangerous precedent has been established in excluding Mr. Berger for voicing opinions nearly three years ago which the courts have not yet finally declared to be disloyal. The result is that Mr. Berger returns to Milwaukee certain of reëlection if the Governor will call another election; while if a new election is not held, Mr. Berger is probably in a fair way to become Governor of Wisconsin. Meanwhile, one of the Milwaukee newspapers which fought Mr. Berger's election most earnestly has come out and told the truth about the vote. An editorial in the *Wisconsin News* declares that the 14,000 non-Socialist voters who cast their ballots for Mr. Berger did so not because they wanted bolshevism or in any degree favored socialism, but because they were imbued "by a spirit of intense protest against certain policies, activities, and conditions born of the war which they hold hostile alike to their Constitutional guarantees, to their personal liberties, to representative government, and to the common welfare." They protested, the *News* asserts, against the policy of "intimidation, coercion, and repression practised by both officials and private agencies during the war"; against the "espionage to which a loyal and law-abiding community was subjected," and against "the propaganda of racial and class antagonism."

ANOTHER American Governor appears to be headed straight for socialism. In his annual message to the Legislature, just published, this Executive solemnly proposes the following ultra-radical laws: (1) a minimum wage; (2) the eight-hour day for all women workers; (3) maternity insurance for expectant mothers; (4) the extension of workmen's compensation to cover occupational illnesses and accidents; (5) the appointment of State physicians and nurses in rural communities now destitute of medical aid, in coöperation with those communities; (6) the ownership, development, and operation of all water-powers by the State; (7) State owned and operated grain elevators in three cities after the manner of the Nonpartisan League experiments in North Dakota; (8) the recognition of the production and distribution of milk as a public utility, subject to the control of the State in all details; and (9) the municipal operation of public utilities. These are not the proposals of a Nonpartisan League Governor of some radical Commonwealth—not even the State grain elevators for which the press of New York so violently abused Governor Frazier of North Dakota. These recommendations for the extension of State control over such private industries as grain storage and the production and marketing of milk emanate from Governor Smith of New York. Yet, curiously enough, they do not seem to have aroused the chorus of disapproval in the daily press which would have arisen had a Western Governor urged, for instance, the socialization of the milk supply. The latter interferes with personal liberty and private business with a vengeance, yet Governor Smith sees no other way to assure a cheap and safe supply of milk for the masses.

THE new professorship of American history, literature, and institutions which has been founded, upon a gift of £20,000 from Sir George Watson, by the Anglo-American Society to celebrate the tercentenary of the Pilgrims has admirable potentialities. Held alternately for the short period of one or two years by an American and a British scholar or public man, it is not to be confined to any one of the British universities or to any single department of knowledge or interest, but is to do what it can to keep flying the shuttle of intellectual relations between America and Britain. We think it a good omen that the professorship is not to be named after the Prince of Wales, as the donor originally proposed. After all, no one doubts that relations will be kept up between the official and fashionable classes of the two countries; but the relation which eventually matters must go deeper, must reach down to the two peoples now separated by so much more than geography and yet related by so much more than blood. Whether the professorship is to be a mere rostrum for international gestures or a real meeting-place for the spiritual ideals of Great Britain and the United States will depend upon whether the lecturers chosen are always the respectable and polished gentlemen who will naturally scramble for it, or sometimes also the representatives of less established or recognized strata of the populations. Longfellow might probably have been chosen in his day, but would Poe have been? Edward Everett, but would Lincoln?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Sowing the Wind to Reap the Whirlwind

THE unprecedented outburst of terror and terrorism which at the moment is venting itself upon Socialists, Communists, "Reds," and agitators of all sorts in this country grows in volume and intensity from day to day. Every morning now brings news of more raids, more scores or hundreds of men and women arrested, more tons of papers seized, more offices and assembly rooms wrecked, more plans for deportation, more promises of purgings yet to come. Ellis Island is crowded to repletion with the victims of the dragnet; one transport loaded with undesirables is just arriving in Europe, and two or three others, it is rumored, are being prepared. Public meetings are broken up or prevented from being held; a Socialist Congressman-elect is ejected from Jersey City by a captain of police. Every radical thinker or reformer in the United States today who belongs to any organization which the Department of Justice has put under the ban, or who expresses sympathy with the men and women who have been pounced upon, puts his personal liberty in danger if his sympathies be known.

It is well, in times of general unreason and hysteria, to fix the mind on simple, fundamental things. If any of the persons, whether aliens or not, upon whom the Department of Justice has descended have violated the law, they should be indicted, tried, and punished for their offense. The Constitution of the United States defines the crime of treason and the conditions under which alone a charge of treason can be sustained; and the courts, in numerous decisions, have made clear the scope and application of the Constitutional provisions. Sedition and conspiracy are offenses known to the law, provable by rules which the law lays down, and punishable by penalties which the law defines with precision. The attempted or actual destruction of life or property, no matter what public motive the perpetrator may announce, belongs in the category of crimes or misdemeanors for which the laws of the United States and of every State provide sufficient and even drastic penalties. There is no "sacred right of revolution" to which the aggrieved citizen may appeal without at the same time imperilling his personal liberty or even his head; the only justification for revolution which courts or governments can recognize is the complete success of the revolt. No government can be expected to allow its foundations to be undermined by treason or sedition without defending itself, and it will defend itself by preventing attacks in advance as well as by meeting assaults in the open.

The case of the alien is as clear as that of the citizen. Barring treaty stipulations, the alien is a guest. The privileges which he enjoys are of the nature of hospitality, resting upon the comity of nations and an accustomed reciprocity of privilege and opportunity. And with the privileges go obligations—obligations to obey the law of the land, to respect the government and its institutions. If, as often happens, the alien is also enjoying the right of asylum, he is further under moral obligation not to plot against the government from whose jurisdiction he has fled; and he certainly violates grossly the spirit of hospitality if he plots attack upon the government which gives him shelter. What shall be done with him if he offends, or if for any reason his further presence is not desired, is for the Government to say. He certainly may be arrested and punished like any citizen if he breaks the law; he may as certainly be expelled or deported if the Government is willing to risk an international controversy.

If such commonplaces of American law covered the whole case of any or all of the thousands of men and women who are being swept into the clutches of the Department of Justice, about all that could be done would be to express regret that so many criminally-minded agitators had been living among us, and to hope that the Department would soon make an end of the unsavory job. Unfortunately for our good name as a nation, however, and for our standing with a Great Power with which we must some day make peace and with which we are already anxious to trade, they do not by any means cover the case. Far the larger number of the persons who have been arrested and confined, and over whose heads, if they be aliens, hangs the prospect of deportation to Russia or elsewhere, appear to have been seized merely upon suspicion. The particular charges against them and the evidence upon which the charges are based have not, so far as we have observed, been made public save in vague or sweeping terms quite insufficient as bases for an opinion. Membership in the Socialist or Communist parties is not a crime even for an alien, nor is a member of a political party answerable at law for the acts of the party, or of any member of it except himself. Few of the persons arrested appear to have been given a preliminary hearing in court, or allowed to furnish reasonable bail, or assured of an opportunity to meet their accusers and offer a defense, although hitherto aliens have always been regarded as entitled to these privileges along with citizens. It would even appear that in numerous cases the persons arrested have been denied the privilege of communicating with their friends or their families. The Government, on the other hand, has not hesitated to issue drum and trumpet statements which, whatever their purpose, have unquestionably had the effect of inflaming the public mind against aliens in general and Russian aliens in particular.

What must happen if this sort of thing goes on, every sober-minded citizen knows. Wholesale arrests and deportations such as we are now witnessing will not breed respect for government or crush out socialism or communism; they will only multiply a hundredfold the number of radicals, and increase many times the volume of discontent. The belief, startlingly confirmed only the other day by no less respectable a body than the Carnegie Foundation, that there is in this country one law for the rich and powerful and another for the poor and weak, will be strengthened; as will the conviction that free speech, free debate, and free publication of opinion, whether for the citizen or the alien, are rights to be enjoyed by such only as say what the Department of Justice and powerful business interests approve. If the rights which the Constitution guarantees to every citizen, and which by general consent have been conceded as privileges to the alien, are to be jeopardized wholesale the country over because some alien agitators have abused them, then assuredly will new and revolutionary doctrines grow apace. We shall not safeguard liberty by repressing it; we shall not raise American prestige abroad by sending overseas the disillusioned and the unassimilated. The only way to end dangerous discontent in the United States is to remove its causes. Unless that is done, those who today are sowing the wind will before long reap the whirlwind.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Food and Finance

SIR GEORGE PAISH has stirred up a veritable hornets' nest among the bankers. The report that he had come to negotiate a huge loan for the British Treasury he promptly and emphatically denies; but he stands by his sensational suggestion of an international bond issue of $35,000,000,000, tax-free, bearing four per cent. interest, redeemable in forty-two years through a sinking fund of one per cent. per annum, repayable in American dollars as the only undepreciated currency, and guaranteed as to principal and interest by the League of Nations. He believes that $15,000,000,000 should be set aside to refund European war debts, $10,000,000,000 used to restock and provide Europe with food and materials, and the remaining $10,000,000,000 used to rebuild devastated regions in Belgium, France, Italy, and Austria. Such a bond issue, he declares, would automatically stabilize exchange and prevent the breakdown of credit all over the world. Sir George Paish is one of the world's leading financial experts. Whatever be thought of his plan, at least he has the vision to see the world's financial problem as a whole, the honesty and courage to state the situation frankly, and the imagination to propose a solution. Hence a torrent of abuse is poured on his head by the little beaters of financial tomtoms whose primary concern seems to be to prevent the world from realizing the seriousness of the present position.

Without necessarily agreeing with these bankers Herbert Hoover, in a statement evidently aimed at Sir George Paish, opposes further loans from the American Treasury, and asserts that the actual need for action on our part is limited to two things: first, the supply of some dozen cities in central and southern Europe with breadstuffs on credit by the Grain Corporation; and, second, the temporary forgoing of interest on our loans to the Allies, who cannot pay this year in any event. Great Britain and France, he declares, can take care of themselves; so can Germany if the Reparation Commission will let it; so can Hungary if Rumania will restore the cattle and grain stolen last year. Bulgaria, Serbia, Rumania, South Russia, and Turkey (except Armenia) will have an exportable surplus. On the other hand, Finland, Poland, Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, and Austria can provide for their country population only. The inhabitants of their cities, and of some Italian cities as well, perhaps fifteen or twenty million persons in all, must be fed, and this should be done on credit and not as a charity. For the rest, Europe must get back to work and to ordinary business processes. Thus Mr. Hoover.

Despite Mr. Hoover's implied criticism of Sir George Paish as a "European propagandist," the differences between these two authorities are far less important than might appear; to a large extent the two men are talking about different things. The world faces a three-fold economic problem. First, there is the question of this year's food supply. Mr. Hoover, who should know better perhaps than anyone else in the world, indicates, possibly in somewhat optimistic terms, his present judgment of the immediate situation. As a measure of common humanity and political insurance, the action he recommends should be promptly taken, and in addition every obstacle to the free movement of goods should be removed. Every day's continuance of blockade or other obstruction to commerce is a fresh act of political folly and moral obliquity.

More difficult and serious is the resumption of full activity in the production and exchange of all necessary goods. This is by no means chiefly a government problem. Mr. Hoover says to the people, sensibly enough, "Get back to work"; yet petty financiers abuse Sir George Paish for declaring that Europe will need loans of $20,000,000,000 to make possible resumption on the old scale. Professor Bogart's sober study of war costs puts property losses in the belligerent states at $29,960,000,000, not to mention shipping and cargo losses of a further $6,800,000,000. Sir George's figures do not look extravagant. The machinery of production and transportation must be recreated; that means work, and credit also. But the task is psychological as well as technical; witness the world-wide unrest of labor and the threat of revolutionary disturbance. Abundant and regular production is not to be assured by adjustment of credits alone, but by economic arrangements that shall impress men as fair and make them want to do their best.

The third problem, not touched by Mr. Hoover but directly attacked by Sir George Paish, is the maintenance of the existing credit system. This is not the same thing as the maintenance of production; the latter is conceivable without the former, but our existing scheme is based on the control of industry through the control of credit. We assume that the great body of American bankers and business men agree with Sir George Paish in desiring a continuance of such control. We assume further that practically all Americans, except those whose faith in the possibility of orderly progress has been wrecked by government ineptitude, agree that a catastrophic breakdown of our economic system, brought about by the long-delayed "collapse" of credit and consequent paralysis of production, would be a disaster of such unparalleled magnitude and such incalculable consequences that it must be prevented if possible. The steady revival of trade, however, even in face of the present demoralized exchange, suggests caution in predicting an early débâcle. None the less, there must be a readjustment of war debts, as Sir George Paish suggests, and we doubt whether his $35,000,000,000 international bond issue indicates the way out. The world must not be enslaved by means of government debts. The exchange situation must be improved by a wise and far-seeing use of banking power in order that Europe may again work and live, which it cannot do without trading. Let the American banker and investor remember that whatever the present character of European governmental or banking credit, loans to Europeans for active productive purposes not only are good business, but are the best insurance against the spread of disorder and disorganization. Let them heed Mr. Hoover's injunction to make no loans to any country that does not resolutely order its internal financial and political situation, devote itself to increasing production, cut down expenditure on luxuries, and treat its neighbors fairly. If our bankers really care for political stability and the permanence of their own gains, they will do their utmost during the coming year to guide the welling stream of American investment, not into the channels that promise the largest immediate returns, but into those that offer the best hope of meeting the world's need for a reëstablished industrial and commercial mechanism. If they fail to meet that need, then in the sure processes of social growth the sceptre will pass from them. Today, as perhaps never before, they must remember that "none of us liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Whom the Gods Would Destroy

THE attempt of the Assembly of the State of New York to shut out the five Socialists who were elected last November has evidently disturbed a good many people who hitherto have watched with apathy or satisfaction the increasingly lawless attempts to coerce opinion in the United States; and the repercussion may do more than all that direct effort has done to restore civil liberty. In New York city the *World*, the *American*, the *Evening Post*, and the *Globe* have come out flatly against the destruction of parliamentary government which the action threatens, while even the *Herald* warns the Albany legislators that their action may bring an increased Socialist vote at the next election, and declares that it is "a good time to go slow." The action of the Assembly awakened opposition, if not consternation, within the Republican party of the State. Mr. Fiorello H. LaGuardia, president of the Board of Aldermen of New York city, lost no time in expressing his disapproval of what had been done at Albany, and in announcing that no similar action would be attempted against the Socialists in the Board of Aldermen. Two days after the action of the Assembly, Mr. Charles E. Hughes issued a statement in which he exposed with admirable clearness both the illegality and the stupidity of the course that had been taken.

The action of the New York Assembly is only tentative, and that body will doubtless find a way, undeservedly, to save itself from some of the consequences of its amazing blunder. The vote denies the five Socialists their seats pending inquiry by the Judiciary Committee. In taking this action, however, the Assembly adopted the extraordinary course of arraigning the men before the Speaker and indicting them in a resolution which was as lacking in logic as it was in an elementary conception of the principles of parliamentary government. Alarmed at the public protest, Speaker Sweet has since endeavored to give the impression that the Assembly voted simply to authorize an inquiry into the seating of the Socialists. A reading of the resolution leaves room for no such quibble. The resolution is a specific attack on the principles of a recognized political party, and leaves no doubt that the Assembly would have barred the Socialists permanently then and there if its rules had permitted. Speaker Sweet himself, in addressing the Socialists, declared: "You have been elected on a platform that is absolutely inimical to the best interests of the State of New York and of the United States." Commenting on this, the *World* observes:

> That is what every political party says about the political platform of every other party. If the action of the New York Assembly can stand as a precedent, representative government has ceased to exist in the State, because all the rights of the minority have been destroyed. No minority party can be represented in the Legislature except on a platform that is satisfactory to the majority party.

The resolution of the Assembly bases the charge that the Socialist party is one of violence chiefly on the expressed sympathy of the party with the Soviet Government of Russia, and on the anti-war attitude of the St. Louis convention of 1917. The expression of solidarity with Soviet Russia which the Socialist party has given has been merely general, and does not by any means commit the party to approval of every act or principle of that Government; while the St. Louis platform, even if itself a ground for action, has been superseded by more recent declarations.

The course of the New York Assembly is not on the same footing with that against Mr. Victor L. Berger in Congress. *The Nation* holds the exclusion of Mr. Berger to be highly questionable, but the action of the House of Representatives has at least the defense that it is directed not against a party or a platform, but against an individual who through judicial process has been convicted of sedition. The Assembly, on the other hand, as the New York *Evening Post* points out, "has arrogated the right to interpret a statement of principles into an attack against the public welfare, and it has made all subscribers to these principles *ipso facto* violators of the law." The right that legislative bodies in general have to pass upon the qualifications of their members is, in intent and in historic practice, a power to decide merely as to whether members have been legally elected. It does not concern their mental or moral fitness; if it did, a number of other members of the New York Assembly would doubtless be insecure in their seats. Granting that all the charges against the Socialists are true, the way to proceed against them is to prosecute them individually under the criminal law.

Finally, and supremely important, the Assembly is playing directly into the hands of those who would achieve political change through revolution rather than through the ballot. The followers of Lenin contend that socialism cannot be achieved through the ballot because, even if a majority is obtained, the present holders of privilege and power will resort to force rather than surrender. Karl Marx wrote in the Communist Manifesto seventy-five years ago: "Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another." Is the Assembly of the State of New York determined to prove that Lenin and Marx were right?

# The German War Inquiry

NOT enough attention has been paid by the press to the extraordinarily illuminating testimony given before the German commission of inquiry as to the causes of the collapse and defeat of Germany. Not merely are facts of vital historical importance to the United States and the Allied peoples being brought out, but the tinsel and gilt with which the German Imperial Government clothed itself to hide its nakedness have now finally been stripped away, and it here stands exposed in all its shams, hypocrisies, and amazing incompetency. From the All-Highest Majesty himself down, we now have a revelation of inefficiency and blundering sufficient to confound all who have believed that, whatever else might be said about the Kaiser's government, it was more scientific and efficient and took better care of its subjects than the average democracy. Further, the net result has been to fasten the chief responsibility for the German defeat upon Ludendorff himself. But Ludendorff merely typified the German military and naval mind which, because there was no Bismarck, or any civilian approaching a Bismarck, to hold the military men in check and to use them for military purposes alone as in 1866 and 1870, dominated Germany in this war.

Moreover, Ludendorff's characteristically unintelligent military mind did not assemble all the facts in the case. It has been brought out that he accepted or believed only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those reports that contained information in accord with his own preconceived ideas. The real facts as to the possible accomplishments of an unlimited submarine warfare he failed to obtain. He deliberately declined to see naval experts and critics outside of the Admiralty; he disregarded, if indeed he ever read, the outspoken warnings of such a distinguished technical writer as Captain Persius of the Berlin *Tageblatt*, who dared to point out that the proposed course could not possibly result in victory. Ludendorff did not verify the usually exaggerated and sometimes false reports of the German submarine commanders; he did not study the problem from the enemy's point of view. He wholly disregarded Count Bernstorff's sound warnings, completely justified by the event, and only by accident met that official after the latter's return from Washington. Finally, General Ludendorff took his opinions from an Admiralty cabal which did not even represent the consensus of naval opinion.

As for the Kaiser, he has figured as yet comparatively little in the inquiry. There are two German commissions at work, one probing into the war, the other dealing with the origin of the war. Thus far the testimony before the first of these bodies goes to confirm the general impression that the Kaiser was as wax in the hands of the militarists and was not sufficiently able or forceful to dominate any situation. Count Bernstorff testified that the Kaiser refused to see him for six or seven weeks after his return. When pressed for the reasons, Bernstorff declared that there were two: first, the Kaiser had been erroneously informed that the Ambassador had allowed the English to capture at Halifax a trunk full of important German diplomatic documents; and, second, that on the occasion of the meeting of the two men in the Bosphorus in 1913, before the war, the Kaiser had upbraided him for permitting "the appointment of a man like Gerard as American Ambassador in Berlin." The rest of Bernstorff's testimony is of value as showing how the Foreign Office directed him to carry on one policy while it was plotting another. His assertions about Mr. Wilson's private efforts to bring about peace in 1916-17 and the use of Colonel House as an intermediary are also important. Whether one trusts Bernstorff fully or not, he could hardly have invented the conversations which he records with Colonel House, who frequently summoned him to New York to talk over peace plans in secret.

Among minor incidents, Count Bernstorff related that the submarine Deutschland brought him two new cable codes from Berlin. He is certain, however, that England deciphered all the German wireless and cable dispatches, and that the delay of nearly two weeks to which he was subjected at Halifax on his return voyage was deliberately planned by the British to keep him from arriving at Berlin in time to work against the unrestricted U-boat warfare. By the time he reached Berlin the die had been cast, but he made no effort to convince anyone of his belief that a fatal error had been made. He also testified, as have others, to his feeling that the loud "popular" demand in a certain section of the German press for an unrestricted sea campaign was deliberately inspired by Ludendorff and others as an excuse for doing what they had already decided upon. As for Bethmann-Hollweg, the net impression obtained from his testimony is that of a well-meaning, weak man, not an imperialist, and humane in his instincts, but utterly unable to cope with and dominate the militarists and reactionaries. He was an obvious misfit from any point of view.

# Subways and Soviets

THE returned doughboy, who has had at least a whiff of international experience, has commonly brought home with him precisely the knowledge of French art and philosophy, French ideals and customs, which he carried overseas. To judge by the conversation which the ordinary citizen of the *Times*-fed variety holds with other citizens of the *Times*-fed variety, all that has been said about the vast interflow of modern ideas from nation to nation has fallen upon no soil at all. But overhear the *Times*-fed citizen on a subject he understands, and his reasoning is better. For instance, hear him talking about Soviet education:

"This fellow Trotzky carried all kinds of American ideas back with him to Russia. Take the I. W. W., for instance, and things like that. But it looks as if some of our good ideas got into his head, too, and he learned more than he realized. At any rate, it looks that way when you read how the Bolsheviki are going to work to educate all the people the easiest way. What they plan to do is to name all the main streets in the towns over again and then make each of them a place to learn something special in. Suppose some main street is named Biography Avenue or Physiology Place or something like that. Well, if it is Biography Avenue, they put up posters everywhere telling about great people in the past, and all anybody has to do is to walk along the street a few times and keep his eyes open, and the first thing he knows he has picked up all he needs to know about biography. Or, if it is Physiology Place, they will have posters everywhere telling about the bones and the muscles and what and how and when and why and where to eat and drink—or not—and soon everybody who goes along that street will get educated in physiology. That looks like too good an idea for a wild man like Trotzky, and the chances are he got the first hint for it in this country.

"Come to think about it, it may have been the Subway. Trotzky, as everybody knows, lived up in the Bronx, and he had to go all the way to the lower East Side every day to his work, whatever it was. He must have read the advertisements in the Subway. Really, they work that way. Now, you take any average American man and let his wife send him to the grocery to buy baking powder, and if the clerk asks him what kind he wants he won't even know there is more than one kind—if there is. Advertising did it. And you line half a dozen average American men up against a stone wall and tell them they'll be shot if they can't tell you more than one kind of collar or one kind of rubber heel or one kind of perfume or one kind of cod liver oil or more than maybe two kinds of garters, and the result will be about five widows—because one of the men was probably a bachelor anyway. Same way with the women. Any man who lost his voice and didn't know how to write and let his wife or his girl buy his cigarettes for him would have to smoke the kind that father used to smoke in the good old days, or something like that. You can't get away from it.

"And yet in a way this fellow Trotzky turned a pretty clever trick that time. Come to think of it, advertising and education are a good deal alike, only you remember what the advertisements tell you because you keep on studying them and can't forget them like the things you learned at school. These Russians are nothing but children, and so you have to keep on teaching them to the end of their days."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Ordeal by Dinner

THAT is what it was, the dinner given on January 8 by the National Democratic Committee to its distinguished guests and all who were willing to pay six dollars to see the candidates for the Democratic Presidential nomination disport themselves. It was a two-ring circus, but the rings were in separate buildings, fortunately enough. What would have happened to the listeners if it had occurred to the committee to let two men speak at once at different ends of the room, it is hard to say. Survival was difficult enough as it was. Imagine a long narrow hall jammed with people smoking steadily from 6:30 until 3 A. M. and listening to twelve set speeches from 8:30 until Mr. Bryan finished and the exhausted hearers adjourned, and you will understand why it was an ordeal by dinner for the listeners as well as the speakers. Each one of the latter was limited to twenty minutes, after which he was supposed to adjourn to the other hotel and wait patiently in line until the time came to repeat the performance. But of course no speaker kept within his limits; if each one had done his duty the dinner would have been over at the reasonable hour of, let us say, twelve-thirty.

What was more exhausting than the hours and the heat and the smoky atmosphere was the steadily increasing disappointment, as time passed, with the intellectual repast offered. In one of the most thrilling times in the history of our nation, everyone was agog to hear what the leaders of the President's party had to say upon the pressing issues of the day and upon the future of the nation. Let it be said at once, that of all the candidates who offered themselves as would-be successors of Woodrow Wilson only one, the Attorney General, seemed in presence and bearing and delivery to measure up to the standard one expects in any country of men competent to govern; yet he had not a single constructive idea to advance. Intellectual quality was otherwise almost totally lacking and the dreary recital of Democratic achievements during the last seven years grew progressively more monotonous as the evening dragged on. There was hardly a thrill, not even when the President's message was read and the Commoner himself appeared and fought his way up to the platform. A disappointing twenty-five seconds of cheering was the best that could be done in either case. Once during Mr. Bryan's speech someone yelled at him "Stand by the President," whereat there was hope that something might be doing at last. But the hope was soon extinguished, or rather the interrupter was, by Mr. Bryan's dignified and effective reply. Not even the appeal for a national "Peaceway" for automobiles stirred the multitude, which was not nearly so excited over Mr. Bryan's differing from the President in regard to the disposition of the treaty-corpse as were the headliners of the morning newspapers. All through the evening rumors had reached the diners that Bryan was going to "cut loose"; that he was coming out for the Plumb plan in no uncertain terms; that he was going to defend liberty once and for all. Nothing but the hope of violent revolution on his part kept most of them in their seats until Mr. Bryan finally appeared only to end, rather tamely, a bathetic evening. He was "the same old Bill."

Mr. Homer S. Cummings, the Chairman of the National Committee, started the ball rolling well and took advantage of his position to make the positive assertion, before anybody else could, that the record of the Democratic party was one of unexcelled glory both in war and in peace. The audience naturally agreed heartily and effectively, being then at the height of its powers of endurance. It was still going strong when the President's letter was read, although the prospect of continuing the treaty fight for the next eleven months, which the President held out as the duty of the party, was not without a decidedly depressing effect. Yet the general verdict at first was that it was a clever move, that the President must be getting well because he was again manifesting some of his old-time political skill, and that the Republicans had been put at a decided disadvantage. Mr. Bryan's arguments gave the finishing blows to this idea, but long before that most of the other speakers found, one after another, that discretion was the better part of valor when it came to the treaty question.

Mr. Hitchcock, of course, plunged boldly into his task of convincing the audience, as if it needed the assurance, that the responsibility for what had happened to the treaty rested exclusively with the wicked Republicans. He is a graceful and suave speaker and he did his best. He was still for a compromise and upon the basis of reservations that would mean little and affect nothing seriously; if the Republicans refused to yield, then, he was sure, the churches, the laborers, the business men, and above all the women would be with the Democrats, for they wanted a league of nations. It would be the paramount issue of the campaign. After this, paramount issues steadily appeared. Governor Cornwell, of West Virginia, was bitterly opposed to an autocracy of either workers or wealth. He was afraid "of the weakening of the people's chosen representatives when the political terrorists come around and attempt to bulldoze them; I am afraid of this modern-day tendency to compromise with nationalization and socialization schemes." His paramount issue for the party was standing by the principles of individual rights, individual liberty, and the individual ownership of property when that property is honestly and lawfully acquired, but his paramount issue did not seem to take well with the representatives of a party which is on the point of passing a sedition law and a press gag bill that will make individual liberty and individual rights more than ever the gift of capricious bureaucrats.

The other "great Democratic Governor" of today followed Governor Cornwell. He was Governor James M. Cox, of Ohio, whom a neighbor described as "ideally and most satisfactorily boresome," so that listening was not obligatory. Whereupon there appeared the *enfant terrible* of the evening, the Honorable James W. Gerard, of New York, who shocked and stunned the audience by refusing to take himself seriously, by never once referring to his relations with the Kaiser, by asserting that the labor union has come to stay, that it has helped the laborer a long way upward and is going to help him still further, and that there are a good many other things that the Democrats and other people ought to do right off to make this world really perfect. The audience resented this—and justly. Had not every preceding speaker assured them that the world was now free for democracy and that America had never been so rich, so prosperous, and so happy as under the beneficent

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rule of Woodrow Wilson? In the very presence of Mr. Palmer himself, this ex-judge brought up a fact that everybody else was careful to ignore—that you cannot dig coal nor settle labor problems by injunctions. One could feel the atmosphere growing chillier every minute. Finally Mr. Gerard violated all the proprieties of the occasion and the most sacred political precedents by calmly repeating the statement of the man who put him in nomination in South Dakota a couple of weeks ago, that he was not the best candidate for the place, that the best candidate was—Herbert Hoover! The audacity and modesty of that avowal on the part of a man seeking the Presidential nomination overcame almost everybody's desire to applaud Mr. Hoover; there were just enough handclaps to sadden the hearts of those in the room who knew of their own knowledge what that self-sacrificing man had done in Europe to merit the plaudits not only of his countrymen but of all the world. This, the reward of merit if you please! Naturally, Mr. Gerard was properly rebuked by the most perfunctory round of applause of the evening when he took his seat.

Followed Oscar Underwood, with hair as immaculately parted as ever, with his broad Alabama accent somewhat broadened for this evening, and with a sententiousness of utterance and deliberateness of delivery which marked him as one who would have made a wonderful success in post-rebellion days by his appeal for devotion to the "principuls" of the Democratic party. It was like listening to a fifty horse-power heavily laden truck laboring uphill in first speed at five miles an hour. "If he only would come into high speed and let her go," one sighed. The hope was vain. But Josephus Daniels "stepped upon" the throttle of his motor and the crowd woke up when he proved conclusively to its and his own satisfaction that the sole motive of the Republican party, ever since the election before the armistice, was to win the hyphen vote. When he finished it was perfectly obvious that the Republican party had been in the pay of the Kaiser for a long time past and still was, with Mr. Lodge as the chief recipient. Champ Clark, too, had the crowd with him by his homely, forceful method of speaking, his quaint twists and his good stories, and everybody rejoiced when the evil Republicans were attacked again and the glories of the Democratic party retold for the eighth successive time.

It was then that Attorney General Palmer scored his success, for which the background was perfect. He has grown heavier since he became the sole savior of our liberties and our institutions, and he was always impressive in appearance. He had learned his piece perfectly and he delivered it faultlessly. He had undoubted eloquence, polish, and skill. He told the same story of Democratic achievements as if it were new, making it dramatic and interesting, and read an amusing platform which he insisted would win the ten-thousand-dollar prize offered by the Republicans for such a document. Then when he came to the dangerous ground of his own achievements, he skimmed over it easily with smooth-sounding words. Of course, he was for liberty, liberty of the press, speech and assembly—what autocrat is not? Only he would draw the dead-line at those who would preach or suggest violence. He carefully forgot to tell why the most drastic of sedition laws was necessary in that case, and he sat down "amid a burst" of as enthusiastic cheering as any man received during the evening, applause which was but an echo of the reception he got when he arose. If applause counts, Mr. Palmer is the leading candidate. His severest critics in the audience admitted a totally new conception of the man's ability and force, while pointing out that he, too, contributed not one new idea to point the way to a solution of the vast number of problems, social, economic, and political, that confront the government.

After the applause for Mr. Palmer had subsided, the only woman speaker of the evening was given a hearing—a sop to the millions of newly enfranchised Democratic voters. My neighbor had been betting me throughout the dreary wastes of oratory that Mrs. Peter Oleson of Minnesota would show the men how to do it. "You just wait and see how she puts it over the whole crowd." When she finished, he disappeared, and I saw him only in the distance thereafter. The best that can be said for the representative of American womanhood is that she was on a par with most of the other speakers, plus a goodly amount of "sob stuff" which went very well with the audience, particularly when she told how, arm-in-arm with an Armenian woman, she stood and looked upon the Statue of Liberty and realized that, thanks to Woodrow Wilson, that beacon light of liberty shone all over the world—or words to that effect. She was particularly grateful to Mr. Wilson for having sent out into the world, not only the greatest but the morally purest army that ever campaigned.

Of Mr. Bryan I have already written. It was another one of the many glorious opportunities which this man has thrown away. He could easily have made himself the leader of his party and the dominating figure in the politics of the country; and it seemed impossible that he should not recognize the opportunity and embrace it. It required only a speech based upon high moral grounds, a reaffirmation of the old Americanism with *real* political and personal liberty, and a denunciation of all who are lowering this America of ours to the level of the Germany of Bismarck's day by warring upon political opinion and disregarding the most sacred tenets and inheritances of the American people. Even if the audience had not responded, the public would have risen to a passionate restatement of the American charter of liberty, and a dedication of the speaker to its restoration. Denunciation of government by injunction and by compromise through the perversion of judicial machinery; a flaying of those Republicans in Albany who have struck such a deadly blow at peaceful evolution in America; a positive assertion from Mr. Bryan that government by terrorism and repression must end—and the welkin would have rung with plaudits. But Mr. Bryan is Mr. Bryan; and the chief burden of his speech was that there was no political advantage to be gained by following the President's advice. Not one thrilling word in behalf of suffering humanity; no real striving for the stars; no sincere, heart-touching idealism. Instead, vague hints as to reorganizing industry with labor's aid, an impossible railroad plan, reaffirmation of the initiative, the referendum, and prohibition—and the Peaceway!

Thus ended an evening in Lilliputia with the Gulliver of social and political unrest and unhappiness not even pricked by the swords of the little men. It was as if they had decided to ignore him as they wandered around picking their steps so carefully as not even to touch him. But what of him? What if he bursts his bonds? What then is to become of the Lilliputians who have no single way to suggest of ridding their country of his abhorrent bulk?

O. G. V.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# American Imitations of Japanese Poetry

By TORAO TAKETOMO

MANY years may pass before the poets of Japan and America will realize how closely they were related in the second decade of the twentieth century. The new movements in the poetry of the two countries, starting almost at the same time, have gone through much the same influences. They do not directly imitate one another, because both of them are facing in the same direction, and the French symbolists and the æsthetic poets of England are their predecessors. Yet it is impossible to overlook the supreme power of Whitman in the present poetry of Japan and the undeniable imitation of the old Japanese poetry in the new poetry of America. In Japan the influence from America has been a matter of life as well as of art. Side by side with the democratic tendency among the social reformers and the political writers in the last two or three years, various poets who are revolting against decadent symbolism—especially against the aristocratic poetry of the so-called literary language—have claimed to be the voices of the Japanese people while imitating the free verse of Whitman. Is it merely for conceits, or patterns as they are called, that American poets have adopted the lyric forms of Japanese poetry?

> As it
> Were tissue of silver
> I'll wear, O fate, thy grey,
> And go, mistily radiant, clad
> Like the moon.

Any Japanese who should read this exquisite poem of Adelaide Crapsey would feel a genuine admiration for its beauty. Simplicity of image and diction and form, pure lyricism, graceful rhythm—all that is precious in Japanese poetry is in this poem. And yet there is something more than imitation. It is more natural than any of the translations of Tanka by Lafcadio Hearn, and, strange to say, more Japanese. Here we are faced with the fact that poetry which seems to be an imitation is really a revelation of something latent in the Western mind. We no longer believe that there are severed hemispheres of thought. That which is true and beautiful in the East is true and beautiful in the West. This truth is simple but it seems new. Japanese poetry could never have been appreciated in England in the age of Pope; the habit of segregating ideas within iambic pentameter couplets would have made impossible any attempt to import the quaint rhymeless verses of the East. Romanticism widened the poetical world. At the very beginning of the movement Coleridge wrote his Kubla Khan, which has, in its stately dreaminess, a certain note of Chinese poetry. With Gautier and his daughter in France, with Fitzgerald, *The Yellow Book*, and the art of Whistler, the poetry of the West gradually reached out toward the East, until there came a poet like William Butler Yeats, whose deep insight reached at last to the essence of Oriental life.

But any such conscious imitation of the poetry of the East as is shown in the contemporary poetry of America has not been known in any preceding literary period. True, some of the delicate lyrics of Emily Dickinson and John B. Tabb might be compared to Oriental poems for their conciseness. Poets like Alfred Noyes and Mary McNeil Fenollosa also have treated Oriental subjects in their poetry. No one of them, however, had the real affiliation with the East which appears in the poetry of Amy Lowell, Richard Aldington, H.D., Ezra Pound, Adelaide Crapsey, and John Gould Fletcher, who have tried not only to dress in Oriental poetry or to sing about the Orient, but to make the Orient their own. Very probably they have learned about Oriental poetry through Western translations. Not to speak of other European languages, it is wonderful to see the great number of books and articles on Japanese art and Japanese literature written in English during the last ten years. English-speaking people are widely acquainted with Japanese literature through Lafcadio Hearn, Basil Hall Chamberlain, and William George Aston. As Ukiyoé or the names of Ukiyoé painters are known among the connoisseurs of art, the poetical forms Tanka and Hokku, and the Nō drama are commonly known among the makers and readers of the new poetry. It may not be presumptuous, therefore, for a Japanese to think that certain American poets have made more or less conscious imitations of Japanese poetry. I am indeed inclined to think that this imitation has been merely a method by which these poets have sought to widen their own world. If the æsthetic poetry of William Morris and Dante Gabriel Rossetti was something more than a reproduction of Greek or mediæval life, why should the poets of America not be more than mere imitators in trying to follow the old traditions of Japan?

Yet still I feel, in discussing these imitations, the need of explaining what is the real nature of Tanka and Hokku in Japan. The difference between them is not only in the quantity of their syllables. It is a great mistake to think that Hokku is a shorter form of Tanka, because that is to miss entirely the different merits of the two kinds of poetry. In Tanka generally the poetic mood is purely subjective and the rhythm rises and falls with complete undulation, while in Hokku it is more objective—the poet is looking on, himself apart. Suppose you draw a circle. In Tanka the line must be gracefully visible; in Hokku it may be dots or short curves, if only they suggest a circle. In either case, of course, the poetry may be either symbolical or descriptive.

I make this comment because it helps me to say what I think of American short poems based on the Japanese. We often hear of something like the "aching beauty of Japanese poetry." But Japanese poetry, especially Tanka in the original, never aches; it is English translations or imitations which seem to have that morbid quality. Short as the originals are, they keep the rhythmic integrity of a complete poem. Nothing is forced, or sharply cut, and the effect is somewhat like a gracious gesture.

> Douces fleurs qu'effleure
> Le toit de notre demeure,
> Quand s'enfuira l'heure
> Où je vous vois dans mes pleurs,
> Ne m'oublicz pas, ô fleurs.
> La Princesse Sikisi

One of the best translations of Japanese poetry is the book entitled "Poèmes de la Libellule" by Judith Gautier, from which I have taken this single example. It is one harmonious whole. You cannot add or omit anything on the soft and delicate lines of this old flower vase.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Among the recent poets of America, none has come closer to the beauty of the Japanese Tanka than Adelaide Crapsey, whose brilliant Cinquains will be a lasting treasure for the people of the two countries. I have cited already the most typical example, but I hardly can refrain from quoting two others which would be envied by the ablest of Japanese poets.

NOVEMBER NIGHT

Listen.
With faint dry sound,
Like steps of passing ghosts
The leaves, frost crisp'd, break from the trees
And fall.

THE GUARDED WOUND

If it
Were a lighter touch
Than petal of flower resting
On grass, oh still too heavy it were,
Too heavy.

An English poet, Richard Aldington, also has written some poems which come to my mind in connection with Tanka. Rich in color, his Images are luxurious effusions which strikingly contrast with the faint delicacy of Miss Crapsey.

IMAGES

I

Like a gondola of green scented fruits
Drifting along the dank canal at Venice,
You, O exquisite one,
Have entered my desolate city.

II

A rose-yellow moon in a pale sky
When the sunset is faint vermilion
In the mist among the tree-boughs,
Art thou to me.

III

The flower which the wind has shaken
Is soon filled again with rain;
So does my mind fill slowly with misgiving
Until you return.

Alice Corbin must also be remembered as a poetess in the Tanka style, on account of a splendid performance.

APPARITIONS

II

When the cold dawn stood above the house-top
Too late I remembered the cry
In the night of a wild bird flying
Through the rain-filled sky.

The poetic merit of Hokku, I said, is entirely dependent upon the power of suggestion. Symbolism is predominant. A separate stanza of a poem may often be treated as a Hokku, sufficing by itself, containing the meaning of the rest which is only the explanation. We can illustrate many such stanzas from the poetry of the Imagists.

Afterglow:
Before the stars peep
I shall creep into the darkness.

This is the last stanza of the Blue Symphony V by John Gould Fletcher. To a Hokku poet it would be enough. Also H. D.'s Garden II, if it were in Hokku, could stop with the three lines of the opening stanza:

O wind, rend open the heat,
Cut apart the heat,
Slit it to tatters.

Of course it lacks a word to suggest a garden, but I suppose it would not be a very hard task to make it a complete poem.

Nothing stronger as a lyric outburst can be found in the old literature of Japan than the following lines by Basho:

Move, O grave!
The voice of my sorrow
Is autumnal wind.

Another such stanza by H. D. could be quoted from Hermes on the Ways II.

Small is
This white stream,
Flowing below ground
From the poplar-shaded hill,
But the water is sweet.

I think there are more poets of Hokku in the present poetry of America than poets of Tanka. There is a tendency to be objective, to look out, and to survey one's soul at its contemplation. Poets are inclined to use the minimum of words, and to prefer images and symbols to explanations of things as they are. Here is a recent poem by Evelyn Scott:

TROPICAL LIFE

White flower,
Your petals float away;
But I hardly hear them.

A similar kind of poem was once composed by Kikaku, a Hokku poet. This is a rare example of the extreme simplicity of Japanese poetry, and of a symbolism which I may compare with Verlaine's Chanson d'Automne.

A leaf falls.
Alas, a leaf!
Fall, on the breeze.

One of the most successful imitations of Hokku is John Gould Fletcher's Moods.

A poet's moods:
Fluttering butterflies in the rain.

Joyce Kilmer has a short poem on Easter. It is not an imitation. It is a beautiful and spontaneous lyric of joy with the fragrance of spring.

EASTER

The air is like a butterfly
With frail blue wings.
The happy earth looks at the sky
And sings.

After I read this poem my mind wandered from Kilmer to Christina Rossetti, but then, far from the depth of my memory, I recalled the following lines by Rausetou:

The New Year's Day!
'Tis fine weather,
Quoth the sparrows.

A poetical world which the Japanese Hokku poets would be delighted to inhabit is revealed in a short poem by Carl Sandburg. A Hokku poet would write it more concisely, but the way of expression, and the meaning, would be just the same.

FOG

The fog comes
On little cat feet.
It sits looking
Over harbor and city
On silent haunches
And then moves on.

One loves what one understands. When Walter Pater says, in his essay on the short stories of Jules Lemaître, that he and the people of his time were not great lovers of the Oriental setting in art and literature because of the too

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vague impression, the lack of "intimacies, the minute and concrete expression of the pathos of life," we admire his serious attitude and his discreet self-consciousness as a critic. I have more sympathy with the indifference of Pater than with the infatuation of Goncourt and others. The short poems of America have nothing to do with Japanese poetry if they are made only for curiosity. They are valuable because they show an intimate understanding of the inner life of Japan which, after all, is a part of their own lives.

Also, it is to be noticed that Tanka and Hokku are rather neglected forms of poetry in contemporary Japan. They are considered traditional, stereotyped patterns, and in spite of a new movement in which many poets have tried to revive the old forms, the general tendency there is to escape from the small worlds of thirty-one or seventeen syllables and to write in entire freedom. It is a strange thing that American poets, in their search for freedom, and in their effort to escape from their own traditional poetry, should have found the poems which to the Japanese seem to limit freedom.

# Foreign Correspondence

## I. The Strangling of Austria*

*Vienna, October 11*

ONE who would fully understand what the Peace Conference, in the mingled fatuity and vindictiveness of its policy, has been capable of doing should go to Austria. Of all the pitiable and tragic spectacles which a once rich, proud, and prosperous state has ever presented, I know of none so pitiable and so tragic as that which this remnant of the former Hapsburg possessions now embodies. On the principle that ancient wrongs, of however long standing, must be forcibly righted, and that non-German peoples long under the control of the Dual Monarchy shall be given independence and the boon of self-determination, there has been left under the name of Austria a state comprising only about one-fourth of the territory and one-fourth of the population formerly included in Austria-Hungary. The provinces which have been stripped away include the richest and largest food producing areas of the former Empire, all the coal fields upon which not only industry and commerce but domestic life as well depended, and most of the important manufacturing centres. The one Austrian port, Trieste, is in the hands of Italy. No person today may enter or leave Austria, no manufactured goods, raw materials, or food supplies may cross the Austrian border in either direction, without passing through the territory of one or more Powers the majority of which, thanks to the bitterness engendered by the war and the machinations of the Wilson-Clemenceau-Lloyd George triumvirate, are to all intents and purposes the enemies of Austria, and two of which at least, Poland and Czecho-Slovakia, are little disposed to treat it with consideration. To cap the climax, Austria has been expressly forbidden by the Peace Conference to unite with Germany, its one natural ally, and Germany on its part has been compelled to abandon a provision of its Constitution which contemplated such a union.

The war which was to make the world safe for democracy has left the Austrian people to die painfully of strangulation. Of the six or seven million inhabitants left to Austria, nearly one-half are in the city of Vienna. Were the entire agricultural population of Austria to do its best, it could not produce food enough to feed Vienna; for much of the best farming land, as I have said, has been lost to Austria, and a good deal of the territory that remains is mountain country unfit for agriculture. The only other resource, the importation of food, is today all but unavailable, partly because there are no manufactures to export in payment for food, partly because the Austrian money, as a result of the war and the prostration of industry, is almost worthless, and partly because neighboring states, themselves short of food, are none too anxious to see food supplies going into Austria. Jugoslavia is reported to have great quantities of foodstuffs for export, and the potato crop in Poland is very large; but there will be little Jugoslav food for Austria so long as Rumania, Hungary, and Italy lie across the path, and Germany is likely to get the surplus of the Polish potato crop. No wonder that hunger, real and dreadful, walks the streets of Vienna, sits at table with the merchant, the public official, and the wage-earner alike, and makes the homes of the poor the scenes of wretchedness and despair; that but for the beneficence of one of Mr. Hoover's organizations, which is feeding daily 200,000 children in Vienna and 60,000 more in other parts of Austria, scarcely one child under thirteen years of age in all Austria could by any possibility have a healthy life even if it survived at all; and that only the profiteers and the few remaining rich, or travellers who have foreign money which they may exchange for kronen, can with all their spending get enough to eat.

If a discrimination may properly be made between two social necessities each of which is universal as well as vital, one would have to say that the lack of coal is for Austria a more appalling catastrophe than the scarcity of food; for with coal some factories at least could operate, railways could maintain a normal service, and cities and towns could still have gas and electricity. But the dearth of coal has prostrated such industry as survived the war. Few factory chimneys in Vienna are today emitting smoke. When I arrived here, the street cars had not been running for a week because there was no coal, and street lights were few and far between. A few hotels and business establishments generate their own electricity for lighting purposes, but there is no power for elevators. At the present rate, it is only a matter of a few weeks when the tram and lighting services in Vienna will have to cease altogether, or operate intermittently on short hours. There is no prospect of adequate heat this winter for schools or hospitals or public buildings or hotels; and it is cold in Vienna in winter. Such supplies as are in contemplation are pitifully inadequate for the needs of a great city: a possible 2,500 tons of coal per day from Czecho-Slovakia for domestic use, reported contracts for one or two hundred thousand tons from America by way of Venice or Trieste, the latter obviously at a price which only the rich can afford to pay. Unless Poland or Czecho-Slovakia, each of which has coal, can in some way be induced or compelled to come to the rescue of Austria, Vienna and the larger cities must freeze; but compulsion is difficult if not impossible, and in any case the supply of coal in the countries named hardly exceeds their own domestic needs. An American coal expert at Vienna told me that the mines of Czecho-Slovakia and Poland were probably producing coal today at their previous normal rate; but the introduction of the eight-hour day coincidently with peace has reduced the total production to a point below the in-

* The second in a series of letters describing conditions in Central Europe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dustrial needs of those countries themselves; and the shortage of coal cars, most of which before the war were German, has curtailed transportation. When the Allies in their wisdom stripped the German railways of rolling stock, they not only paralyzed the industry of Austria, but struck a blow as well at the industry of two of the new states which the Allies themselves had recognized.

Under such circumstances, the life of any Government will depend very largely upon its ability to cope with the economic difficulties of a depreciated currency, stagnation of industry, unemployment, hunger, and cold. The financial proposals of Dr. J. Schumpeter, the Minister of Finance, contemplate a broad but drastic treatment of the situation. The essential elements of the program are a capital levy, designed particularly to reach the wealth that has been accumulated during the war, and rising to a maximum of sixty-five per cent.; the imposition of new taxes or the raising of old ones upon all luxuries and a few necessaries, and an increase in postal, telegraph, and railway rates; the privilege of paying taxes in the various war loans at the price of issue, a price in each case considerably higher than the current rate; and the contracting of temporary loans which it is hoped America will supply. With the scheme goes also the pathetic hope of raising some millions by selling the art treasures in the former royal palaces or pledging them as collateral for loans. The opposition to the budget, which at this writing appears to be considerable, comes principally from two sources: on the one hand from the profiteers, and certain banking interests closely associated with them; on the other from the radical Socialists, headed by Dr. Otto Bauer, who wish to take advantage of the virtually bankrupt condition of the country to introduce socialistic reforms.

I venture the prediction that the budget will be rejected, that Dr. Schumpeter, who is one of the ablest financiers, if not the ablest, in Austrian public life at the moment, will be dropped, and that the Renner Government will be reconstructed.* That the policy advocated by Bauer, however, will be adopted seems by no means certain. In the present acute economic situation, the Austrian public, in Vienna at least, appears to be more concerned with the pressing daily struggle for food and fuel than it is with politics; and when a people reaches that stage, revolution is not far off. I listened one cold afternoon, just at dusk, to a group of Socialist speakers who were addressing a crowd of several thousand persons, men and women, workmen and soldiers, in one of the great open spaces of the Ring. The argument was simple and direct. For years, declared the speakers, we have suffered and endured; for years we have been cajoled with promises and put off with superficial and half-hearted reforms. What have we gained? Today, after all our struggle, we are hungry, cold, penniless, and without hope. Our wives and children suffer and we cannot help them. Meantime the profiteer sweeps by us in his automobile, and the rich fare sumptuously every day. Now the winter is upon us, and there is no work. Shall we go on thus until the Allies have completed our destruction, and we die, or shall we take the power that belongs to us? This is the future, a future of violent and far-reaching revolution, which faces the Austria upon which the great triumvirate has set its strangle hold.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

* Since this article was written Dr. Schumpeter has resigned and the Renner Ministry has been reconstructed.—EDITOR OF THE NATION.

## II. The Scrapping of the Cabinet

*London, November 17*

IN former times, whatever the subject in dispute, there was at least a Government policy for the Opposition to criticize. One might start from the assumption that the proposals set before the country were a definite plan, hammered out in meetings of a Cabinet which was collectively responsible to Parliament. For nearly three years that assumption has no longer held. The traditional Cabinet system has been scrapped, and the authoritative text-books on the law and practice of the Constitution, from Bagehot to Lawrence Lowell, have on this topic become obsolete. In these days the utterances and official announcements of Ministers are constantly clashing with one another. One Minister, indeed, scarcely knows what another Minister is doing.

The change came in with the Lloyd George Administration. On the question of man-power, for instance, we had repeated triangular conflicts between the War Office, the Ministry of Munitions, and the Ministry of National Service. In a speech on January 16, 1918, G. N. Barnes, a member of the War Cabinet, publicly criticized Winston Churchill's action, as Minister of Munitions, in granting a 12½ per cent. war-time bonus to time workers in the engineering trades. He described Mr. Churchill as "butting in" with a new principle absolutely against the principle on which the Government had been acting. During the election campaign in December of the same year Mr. Churchill announced, in reply to a heckler, that the Government intended to nationalize the railways. The next month Mr. Barnes remarked in one of his speeches that he was glad to see that the railways were to be nationalized. Though a member of the Cabinet, he got his first intimation of the alleged intention of the Government from this casual announcement of Mr. Churchill's, and did not seem in the least surprised to find that so important a decision had been reached without his knowing anything about it. It turned out later that Mr. Churchill had made the announcement in error, and that the Government did not really intend to take the step indicated. In July, 1919, a remark made by Mr. Churchill in Parliament showed how far the Cabinet system had been departed from. When pressed by a private member to secure a discussion on the cable delays which were irritating the commercial world and impeding trade, the Secretary for War replied that "my honorable friend has as good access to the Leader of the House as I have." Under the old system the responsible Minister would have brought the question before the Cabinet, and the Leader of the House would have acted on its decision.

In the same month the appointment of a Select Committee to deal with the problem of profiteering brought out from the Food Controller an official statement which was flatly contradicted the next day by the President of the Board of Trade. Last October, in his economy speech at Sheffield, the Prime Minister announced in a casual way that the bread subsidy would soon be discontinued. His colleagues, including the Food Minister, received their first intimation of this change of policy from reading the report of the speech in the newspapers. *The Times* of October 24 called attention to the fact that it was hardly possible to say who was responsible for the foreign policy of the country. The British representative on the Supreme Council in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paris had agreed to issue an invitation to Germany to cooperate with the Allies against Bolshevik Russia, while the Foreign Office remained for six days in ignorance of the step he had taken. There had been an acrimonious correspondence between the British and French Prime Ministers upon the Syrian question, in regard to which the Foreign Offices in London and Paris had been negotiating independently. Similarly, Mr. Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, officially advocated a scheme of Indian reform which had not received the sanction of the Cabinet.

Another startling innovation is the practice recently adopted by some Ministers of contributing to the press articles in which they advocate certain policies in matters outside the scope of their own departments. Winston Churchill's discussion of British foreign policy in *The Weekly Dispatch* would have been treated as an unpardonable offense in a previous generation. Gladstone would have summarily dismissed any member of his Cabinet who made the newspaper press, instead of the Cabinet and Parliament, the channel for the expression of his views.

It is said that, at the end of the Cabinet meeting which agreed to propose a fixed duty on corn, Lord Melbourne put his back to the door, and said: "Now is it to lower the price of corn or isn't it? It does not much matter which we say, but, mind, we must all say the same." Any such idea of the necessity of unanimity in the utterances of Cabinet Ministers has lately become entirely obsolete. They seem to feel no need of being agreed even on what the Government policy is, much less on what the effects of that policy are expected to be. Members of the same Ministry are as independent of one another in the expression of their opinions as members of the same club or of the same debating society.

Under the old system, the Cabinet served as a supreme clearing-house of ideas on national policies. The heads of all the great departments were members of it, and at a Cabinet meeting each of them placed his views (or those of his department) before his colleagues and accepted the decision of the whole body. When everything was thus threshed out in common consultation, there resulted a common knowledge of the operation of the whole machinery of government. During the war the number of departments was greatly increased by the creation of new offices and on the plea, for which a good deal could be said, that the resultant body was too large to deal efficiently with the urgent problems of war-time conditions. Mr. Lloyd George substituted for it a small committee, called the War Cabinet, composed of men who were wholly free from departmental duties and could give their whole time and thought to the questions, especially of strategy, that seemed to be of first-rate importance. Ministers who were departmental chiefs were thus left out in the cold. Those of them who were on intimate terms with the Prime Minister could influence his decisions either by breakfasts at Downing Street or by aerial flights to Paris, while those who were not so fortunate had to approach him through the new Secretariat he set up—popularly called the "Kindergarten," partly because they occupied at first certain temporary buildings in the garden of the Prime Minister's residence, and partly because they consisted largely of those that remained of Lord Milner's "young men" in South Africa. Some of them preferred to gang their ain gait and to run their departments on their own devices, trusting that the Prime Minister's preoccupation with other matters would prevent them from being interfered with.

The result has been a state of confusion not far removed from anarchy. It has, indeed, been saved from anarchy only through the exercise of almost despotic powers by the Prime Minister himself, whenever the muddle led to a crisis which demanded decisive settlement. *The Times* does not exaggerate when it speaks of "the system of personal, almost Presidential government which Mr. Lloyd George has evolved during the last two and a half years." He enjoys, it says, "all the advantages attaching to the offices of a British Prime Minister and of a President of the United States, while seeking to rid himself of the checks and balances with which each office is supposed to be surrounded." The experiment of a small inner Cabinet, relieved from departmental duties in order to devote themselves wholly to the conduct of the war, and, since the armistice, to the major problems of reconstruction, has been a conspicuous failure. Each such problem has vitally affected one department, at least, and could not be settled without information which the department only could supply. Accordingly the Ministers without portfolios have had to spend a great part of their time in going through masses of despatches and reports, and in getting up cases with which the departmental Ministers were already familiar in the ordinary course of their work. In the long run there has been no saving of time or energy, and the business of the nation has suffered through having to be settled largely by persons who were not in direct touch with it. It meant ultimately the leaving of almost every important issue to be decided by the Prime Minister himself, and while he was in Paris for months at a time his principal deputy, Bonar Law, was on the wing between London and Paris every few days to learn what he was to say to the House of Commons. It has been government by Mr. Lloyd George.

At the end of October it was announced that the small inner Cabinet was to be dissolved and that a full Cabinet of twenty members was to be restored—a Cabinet numbering only three members less than Mr. Asquith's Coalition Cabinet, which Mr. Lloyd George contemptuously compared to a Sanhedrin. It is generally doubted whether the reality of this change will correspond to its outward appearance. *The Westminster Gazette* wisely suggests that it is for Parliament to see that the new Cabinet is a reality, as it can do by making it clear that it regards the twenty as collectively responsible for all the proceedings of the Government. "It should ascertain," it says, "whether they have the same privileges, including full access to all papers, on foreign as well as home affairs, as were enjoyed by pre-war Cabinet Ministers, and it should require that the old practice be restored of notifying the meetings of the Cabinet through the newspapers and stating which Ministers attended. If these forms are observed, and if the twenty prove to possess an average degree of self-respect and self-assertiveness, we shall begin to get back to the old position in which a Government was a Government and a Cabinet a Cabinet."

HERBERT W. HORWILL.

## Contributors to This Issue

TORAO TAKETOMO is a Japanese poet and critic who has lived for some years in New York studying modern European and American literature.

FREDERICK PETERSON, the distinguished neurologist and psychiatrist, is known in literary circles as a writer of verse and translations of unusual beauty.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Winter Garden

By FREDERICK PETERSON

The Master said, "When the year becomes cold, then we know how the pine and the cypress are the last to lose their leaves."—Confucian Analects.

LET us shut the Summer in when the year is growing old
And build a fortress round her against the Khan of Cold
With bastions of cypress, cedar, pine and fir,
And walls of yew and ivy floors, and keep them green for her.

With berries of the berberis and beds of bitter-sweet
To entangle her and hold her and charm her flying feet.
Let us keep the sun and birds with us that Summer may not know
How the snow-white phantom horsemen ride and drive to and fro.

Outside, the Khan is there with his cohorts hundreds deep,
But in this green Elysium the rhododendrons keep
With the juniper and holly the dreams that haunt them yet
Of the spirit of the Summer they never would forget.

# In the Driftway

TWO recent incidents of the sea have given the Drifter great comfort and renewed his faith in the return of humanity with peace. One of the first German ships to cross the ocean since the armistice, the bark Paul, met with terrific seas and gales and was pounded almost to pieces. It was the gallantry of a British sea captain to which she owes her arrival in Halifax. That sea captain had had a previous ship sunk under him by a German submarine, which subsequently fired upon the lifeboats. Yet when this Englishman saw the Paul in distress, he did not heed the assertions of certain British agitators who have declared that no German mariner in distress would ever be succored by Englishmen again. All honor to Captain Musgrave of the Manchester Merchant! The other incident was the rescue by a German fishing boat of an American crew whose steamer was sunk by a mine.

* * * * *

IT is with no slight emotion that the Drifter "sees by the papers" that Babe Ruth has been purchased by the Yankees for $125,000. The sporting editor of *The Nation* wants to run a four-page supplement on pink paper, giving a complete report of Babe's home-run record for last year and other details. While not quite endorsing this suggestion, the Drifter thinks the event should not pass without mention in this column to which nothing human is alien—even the Reds, or their persecutors, the Yellows. The transaction is, of course, a reminder of the premium on youth in this country. That a mere Babe can command $125,000 is food for reflection, and suggests, as does a study of the infant's photograph, that this Ruth youngster is amply entitled to be described as a "bouncing boy." Moreover, the success of this first magnitude baseball star appears to the Drifter as a justification of our much-assailed educational methods. Let schoolmasters who have been condemned for turning out nothing but dunces and the modern office boy take heart. Babe Ruth is a product of our great democratic educational system—of a reform school at that. Here is a suggestion for parents who are distraught between the claims of private and public schools as places of education for their sons. Let them fix their eye on Babe Ruth, the $125,000 batter, and consider the possibilities of our reformatories.

* * * * *

TO many of the Drifter's friends on the bleachers there is only one Ruth—Ruth the Babe, now Ruth the Yankee. Perhaps it is *lèse majesté* to recall another, but from Sunday-school days the Drifter remembers that there are several pages on the subject in the Bible between Judges and Kings—harsh companions, both, for a Babe or a Ruth. There are striking differences in the careers of Ruth the Moabitess and Ruth the Babe. The lives of both fell, as the Bible puts it, "in the days when the judges ruled," but Ruth the Moabitess gleaned in the barley field, while it is in the outfield that Ruth the Babe picks up the hot ones. Then, too, this Boaz in whose eyes Ruth the Babe hath found favor paid out not six measures of barley but 125,000 measures of paper to have and to hold. The Bible says of Ruth the Moabitess that when she met Boaz "she fell on her face." Not an unknown occurrence, this, on the baseball field, and something that Ruth the Babe has done many times in sliding for second. Considering, though, that reports have it that the baseball star is to stick out for a raise in salary from $10,000 to $20,000 a year, it would seem true to say of the meeting between Boaz II and Ruth the Babe that the latter fell not on his face but landed very much on his feet. No one should begrudge $20,000 a year to Babe. The Drifter would far rather see that sum paid to this excellent product of a reform school than to some of our captains of industry who reveal the effect of no such influence. This is a Ruthless age (the Drifter has been trying to withstand this pun from the start but can hold out no longer) in which we are greatly in need of men who, like Babe, can smash out a home run for their side before the game is called because of darkness. There are plenty of men on the benches who can bunt the ball now and then and beat it to first; there are plenty who can steal second on a slow-limbed catcher; but the cheers of the bleachers are waiting for the man who can wallop the pill on the nose for a tour around the circuit. There is a New Book of Ruth waiting to be written for that Babe.

* * * * *

WHICH brings the Drifter to a final word on the influence that the name may have had in making Babe Ruth a great baseball player; or more probably the effect that his great playing had in the getting and retention of such a name. When the public knows a man as Bill or Jack or Dick or Pete, it is a sign that he is coming on, but it is not until he becomes Fatty Arbuckle, Kid McCoy, or Babe Ruth that he may be said to have finally arrived in the hearts of his countrymen. And this proves, despite all claims, what a small niche the poet or the painter occupies in the affections of his generation. It is hard to recall a single writer who is familiarly known as "Lefty," or an artist who answers to the sobriquet of "Socks." Some day the humble writer of this column hopes to be known as Babe Drifter. Then he will renounce his humility, and, knocking boldly on the door of our efficiency engineer, will demand in clarion tones that his salary, too, be raised from $10,000 to $20,000.

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Literature

## Vacancies and Vagaries

*Shadowy Thresholds.* By Cale Young Rice. The Century Company.

*Dust and Light.* By John Hall Wheelock. Charles Scribner's Sons.

*My Rose and Other Poems.* By Euphemia Macleod. The Four Seas Company.

*Shining Fields and Dark Towers.* By John Bunker. John Lane Company.

*A World of Windows and Other Poems.* By Charles Hanson Towne. George H. Doran Company.

*Blue Smoke.* By Karle Wilson Baker. Yale University Press.

*Banners.* By Babette Deutsch. George H. Doran Company.

*Profiles from China.* By Eunice Tietjens. Alfred A. Knopf.

*Body and Raiment.* By Eunice Tietjens. Alfred A. Knopf.

THE worm whose lot it may be, some not very distant day, quietly to feed upon this heap of minor American poetry, will most of the time have easy going, provided he begins at the top and eats straight down. The upper five of these nine volumes appear to have been composed without serious effort, and can be read without effort at all; doubtless they will age rapidly and go the high, dry way of all unoriginal verse. Only the four volumes at the bottom contain any of the stuff that challenges the reviewer and resists the worm at their accustomed tasks.

Mr. Rice, to speak of the man before the poet, is being devoured even now by a suspicion that a conspiracy exists to steal his reputation. In a preface which recalls no other age than that of Pope and Dennis he urges the reader to remember that he is a veteran of American verse, and to believe that he is the victim now of a jealous disrespect in Mr. Louis Untermeyer and others. "Every poet," he explains, "who is called by any considerable number of reviewers a foremost, or *the* foremost, poet of his country, is naturally a mark for criticism by those poet-critics who aspire to his place. Or if criticism fails, to a boycott of silence—on the theory that an enemy who has achieved should not be advertised. And especially is this the case if such a poet be an advocate of the full freedom of poetry as against the narrow autocracy of any 'ism' which the aspirants happen to be riding." Mr. Rice offers then a definition of poetry at its fullest and freest, intimating that his own product is far from meagre and anything but creed-bound. The spectacle of an injured poet appealing to the public for justice is amusing, when it is not pathetic. One wonders why Mr. Rice should have wished to be either. Reputations can be smothered for a while, but good poetry is irrepressible. Mr. Rice, who even in America's leaner years was not *the* foremost poet of his country, and who now, when competition blunts and bewilders him, is hardly *a* foremost poet, should study his contemporaries. Their "isms" are often ludicrous enough, but often too they lead to bright and beautiful worlds. By continuing in his old blithe, obvious vein he misses that bitter-sweet perfection which is the edge and essence of all good verse today. His various rotundities—his facile wonderment, his over-familiarity with infinity, eternity, and God, his mediocre mysticism—never were effective among thoughtful readers; among casual readers now they will soil any impression of brand-newness which he may have expected to create when he included a couple of Chinese poems in his collection.

Mr. Wheelock also has failed, during the six years since the publication of his last volume, to learn, what is the most important thing for an American poet to know, that vagueness is fatal. Mr. Wheelock is handy with his meters, and is something of an expert when it comes to distributing emphasis; but when it comes to speaking the things that educated people read poetry for, he is only the husk and shadow of a poet. He goes through the approved motions, but he cuts no figure, he makes no impact. As incorrigibly minor poets will, he talks proprietarily of Poetry and God. Like many who have no message to convey, he is glib with wonder at the message-bearing powers of verse. Of course he is a pantheist, and worships Earth; he is a diluted Emerson, without aromatic fire, and a diluted Meredith, without tangled, wooded passion. He pretends to intimacy with the immensities, including among these all "shimmering cries and stars and dreams," not to mention "the sacred spaces of the vast and virgin sea." He is often found near the ocean, leaning against mighty gales and harkening to the philosophic gulls that fly and cry. He dreams with eyes that cannot blink, and he hungers on a comfortably full stomach. Because he lacks a single stray wisp of humor, his ardors are never convincing; one sees they are hardly his own.

Miss Macleod moves in a Canadian mist which, while it is all her own, is scarcely enviable. Her procedure, in the absence of any particular inspiration, is to set drifting across the face of her subject a succession of palely tinted and thinly vibrant vapors. Assuming an analogy between the poet and the painter, as well as one between the poet and the musician, she applies her colors and sounds with conscious craft, she generates with patient care her clouds of descriptive adjectives. The result is not poetry, or any kind of good writing, but a homeless wash and swish. Some of Miss Macleod's poems are anti-vivisectionist propaganda. Statistics would have performed the office better.

The publishers of Mr. Bunker, and probably Mr. Bunker himself, have banked upon his youth as something that would insure to "Shining Fields" an affable acceptance by a tolerant world. Those of the world who care more for poetry as such than for youth as such will not complain because this young poet has been frankly imitative of Spenser, Shakespeare, Crashaw, Milton, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Francis Thompson; many an important career, they will remember, began exactly that way. But they will mark the absence here of any other note than that of the merest and most commonplace immaturity. Immaturity is not the equivalent of innocence, and disingenuousness seldom survives exploitation. Mr. Bunker is direct, fluent, enthusiastic, and harmless, with good impulses and ordinary vision. His sentiments seem almost rash, they are so conventional; as may best be seen in the free-verse "New York Sketches," where an effect of winning simplicity is sought but not gained through such lines as:

> Babies!
> My gracious, there was just a stream of *them!*
> . . . . . .
>
> My, but she was beautiful!
> . . . . . .
>
> But really, you know,
> It isn't what one *does* that counts,
> But what one *is.*

Although Mr. Towne is old enough to know much more than Mr. Bunker, he does not. He is old enough to have learned the secret of detaching himself from the life he treats, and indeed he does appear to view it from a distance; but that distance is measured in terms of sheer silly sentiment, not in terms of philosophy or competent cynicism. He is tenderly, condescendingly sorry for the "sad, mad people" who make up the "sad, glad world." His favorite adjectives, "little" and "old," he happens not to have joined anywhere in the present volume; no doubt he will join them in his next. One might risk a prediction, for instance, that he will bring "Oh, World! Oh, Life! Oh, Time!" strictly up-to-date, and write: "Don't cry, little old world, don't cry!"

Relief comes in the shape of three honestly gifted women, each of whom possesses a faculty deserving of more attention than it is now receiving either from the public or from herself. Mrs. Baker's metaphors from nature have an almost unexam-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pled finesse. She draws down trees, birds, stars, prints them on her page with a diamond delicacy, heats and lights them into a tender, fiery transparency. The clarity of their outline is such that they seem fairly to tremble, yet they are firm and, when necessary, hard. Mrs. Baker is happiest when she has something hard and perfect to enclose, compress, and polish. Much of her volume is not of this sort, and is therefore comparatively uninteresting. Her ideas are often second-hand, and her ardors, sweet and genuine though some of them, particularly those for her children, may be, are not perhaps distinguished enough to wear well. The solid core of her work, however, though small, is fine, being composed of about a dozen quatrains and stanzas comparable with this address to the cardinal:

Pulse of the gorgeous world, jubilant, strong—
Thy song a whistled splendor, and thy coat
A fiery song! From thy triumphant throat
How I have heard it pouring, loud and long,
Whipping the air as with a scarlet thong—
The joyous lashing of thy triple note
Which all the tamer noonday noises smote,
And clove a royal pathway through the throng!

The vision of the young authoress of "Banners" seldom comes to a perfect focus. Most of her outlines are blurred by superfluous or expected epithets. A writer of *vers libre* must first of all be select and fresh, even at the risk of becoming cryptic and bizarre. Miss Deutsch draws too recklessly upon the current slush-fund of poetry for her details, seeking a false security among known themes: the wind, the sky, bacchantic laughter, trees, virgins, boys. Most of the time, as well, her style is too easy to be arresting; she is defeated by her own felicity. Obviousness of rhythm, especially when that rhythm is of phrasing rather than of thinking, soon cloys if it is combined, as here, with an outlook that is not every moment original, if it operates, that is, among glib or borrowed phrases. But occasionally Miss Deutsch does come to a focus, and then her triumph is undeniable. She is best when describing a dance, for she seems to be one of those persons who sooner or later get spoken of as artists to their finger tips; her blood beats excellent time. She communicates a stealthy rapture to sensitive readers in such pieces as "Bacchanal," where she is peculiarly and acutely alive. The motions of the mad Greek maidens are reproduced in terms of purely pagan light and shadow. The "beautiful stamping feet," the "glad hands softly beating," the fingers "spread on the air" flash white in the darkness for a brief but brilliant moment that still clings to the memory.

Mrs. Tietjens, to come now to the real jewel under so much straw, is an almost perpetual delight. She is not without her flaw, but her flaw is one which she can hide if she will; it seems unlikely that she should ever mend it. She is not fitted, in short, for mystical utterance; she is not herself when she is trying to be round or soft or pretty. The dreams of the world do not drift naturally in her direction, or ever catch in her hair; fancies from afar do not alight instinctively on her fingers. She complains somewhere:

I have too many selves to know the one.

If she still does not know the one, we think we do.

I've a modern, rather mannish self,
Lives gladly in Chicago . . . likes to write
Poems of drug clerks and machinery.

With certain modifications, that seems to be the Mrs. Tietjens whom Mrs. Tietjens can afford to indulge the farthest. Not that she indulges the other Mrs. Tietjens fatally far; it simply is suggested that she should not indulge her at all, if she aims to expose a perfect surface. Mrs. Tietjens's real forte is her intelligence. She hardly is matched in America today, she certainly is not in England, for wit. Few of her pages lack clean, powerful, forward strokes, some of which were made while her brain was heated, some after it had cooled, but all of which issued from a superior head. "Profiles from China," printed now a second time, contains verse as cool and free as any that is to be found. Possibly the book is too cool, and suggests the best journalism rather than the best art. At any rate, here are set down with exquisite precision the first and last impressions of a shrewd Western woman stranded awhile in an Eastern world. She declines to grow mysterious over slant-eyed psychology; she only tells how it amused her, or how it forced her pity. Sometimes she gives information merely, as if she were writing home. At other times she concentrates upon attitudes, and extracts quintessences. Volumes might fail to tell about China's apathy what "The Bridge" tells.

"Body and Raiment" is not journalism, but poetry of a definite sort. Mrs. Tietjens proves in it that she can attack her materials with passion, and heat them into form, yet still retain her humor and her detachment. Her *vers libre* is of the best, being taut and nervous, subtly poised, spare and strong, and when necessary tuned with unobtrusive rhyme. "The Drug Clerk" and "The Steam Shovel," poems which their author seems fully justified in prizing, are so modern that they crackle in their wrappings; but they would reinforce any anthology of English verse, no matter what its limits. "To my Friend, Grown Famous," addressed to Edgar Lee Masters from Japan, yields a fairly satisfactory instance of Mrs. Tietjens's keenest temper and purest skill:

Here in this land of frozen loveliness,
Of artistry complete, where each small thing
Minutely, preciously, is perfect,
I have grown hungry for the sight of you
Who are not perfect,
Who are big and free
And largely vulgar like the peasantry,
And full of sorrows for mankind.
I cannot find
Your spirit in this land. The little tree
Tortured and dwarfed—oh! beautiful I know
In the gray slanting rain,
But tortured even so—
The little pine tree in my garden close
Is symbol of the soul that grows
Within this patient cult of loveliness.
You would not understand,
Would care far less
For the pale, silvered shadows of this land
That make it dear to me.
Yet when I see
Your clear handwriting march across the page,
And your brave spirit of a tonic age
Blow sharp across the spring,
I smother here a little;
This conscious beauty is so light, so brittle,
So frail a thing!

M. V. D.

## Religion and Culture

*Religion and Culture.* By Frederick Schleiter. The Columbia University Press.

IT is certain that this book is a protest against hasty generalizations on the origin of religion. It is almost as certain that it is a protest against any generalizations on the origin of religion. The philosophy underlying it seems, indeed, to go farther even than this and to be a protest against any generalizations anywhere.

In order to arrive at a basis for generalization, famous investigators in this field have tried in various ways to bring a false simplicity into the complex problem of primitive religion. Some have tried to isolate a delimited area—Central Australia or Borneo or Celebes, for example—from the rest of the earth, and then have sought by an intensive study of that area to plot the curve for all religious development. Others, demonstrating this isolation to be fanciful, have unduly emphasized the importance of cultural elements, which have been transmitted from one group to another. Still others, for the sake of a wider induction, have sought to compare the development of one people with another. In doing so, they have subsumed heterogeneous elements under familiar captions. Dr. Schleiter believes that every term or practice in a primitive religion depends for its significance and meaning on its place in its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own culture. As each culture, however, whatever its origin may have been, is on a different plane, and each element is *sui generis*, the comparative method of the study of religion is a *fata morgana*. Dr. Schleiter does not quite say this. He is frank enough to confess that Dean Woodbridge has dissuaded him from damning the comparative method altogether, but it is clear that he would like to. At the length of three rather tortuous chapters, the author is at pains to insist that even the concept of casuality cannot be made the basis of a generalization in religion, because it connotes such diverse things, and because such diverse mental processes have converged to produce it, such as it is—"a dynamic relationship between two or more elements" being its only morphological constant.

The most interesting denunciation in the book to most readers, however—and the best supported—is meted out to such great names as Tylor and Frazer and Codrington and Comte and Spencer, for attempting to confine the varied facts of primitive religious history within one evolutionary theory. "In the last analysis, all evolutionary theories go back to an hypothetical primordium, which furnishes the starting-point of their serial arrangement of data. If, however, in the selecting of the primary stage, the writer contrives to seize the wrong pig by the ear, his further periods of development will not exhibit progressive improvement." Dr. Schleiter thinks the correct "hypothetical primordium" has not been found. The reader is forced to doubt its existence. Totemism, Animism or Spiritism, Magic, all are wrong pigs. In the first place, there is no unilinear development; in the second place, we do not understand savage psychology. Actual power reached the savage from concrete objects, such as the loadstone and jewels. He did not need to connect them with "causes" of any kind—neither with spirits nor with the impersonal magic "mana" which the pre-animists stress. Dr. Schleiter accuses the evolutionists of "dragging out schemes which are the products of the cloister" and "weaving materials into a novelistic narrative." The final impression of the book is that human nature is so complex that it is unscientific to explain by any single formula the rise of religion. It is a variable product of the diverse reactions of the nature of man upon the strange objects and energies of the world.

The style of the book is technical; its capitalization and punctuation are eccentric; quotations are repeated; its contents cover only a first chapter of the treatise which its large title suggests. Nevertheless, it is a book which should be widely read by those, on the one hand, who have been dissatisfied with the various dogmatic explanations of the rise of religion, and by those, on the other hand, who believe that monotheism can still be taken for granted. For the book is only one more evidence that our generation holds less and less to a prepossession of unity. As one reads this book, one seems to be walking on the verge of a "pluralistic universe."

## Minor Playwrights

*Tête-d'Or*. By Paul Claudel. Translated by John Strong Newberry. Yale University Press.

*The Soothsayer*. By Verner von Heidenstamm. Translated by Karoline M. Knudson. The Four Seas Company.

*A Cry Out of the Dark*. By Henry Bailey Stevens. The Four Seas Company.

*The Lamp of Heaven*. By L. Worthington Smith. The Four Seas Company.

*Dr. Jonathan. A Play in Three Acts*. By Winston Churchill. The Macmillan Company.

*The Gibson Upright*. By Booth Tarkington and Harry Leon Wilson. Doubleday, Page and Company.

PERHAPS the most tantalizing sort of literature is that which goes through grandiose gestures. It is like a man's portentous shadow on a moonlit wall. You approach the man who throws the shadow and find him neither gigantic nor authoritative, only bustling and eager and confused. To apply this to "Tête-d'Or" is not, of course, to deny for a moment the great gifts of M. Paul Claudel. He has a powerful imagination, though it leads him toward the vast and empty rather than toward the great and concrete; he is a master of speech, though often his violence seems to betray moments of poverty. His form is characteristic. These masses of long, loose chanting have no inner organization of any kind. They never compel the poet to a definite meaning, however subtle, nor to any development of thought, however intricate. Yet they commend themselves, as other examples illustrate, to the many who have rather keen æsthetic perceptions, but whom, like a still greater majority, "it hurts to think." Within these chants there are passages of noble and simple imagery and of fine, concentrated expressiveness. But such passages are isolated and the great clouds of rhythm pass onward in their original aimlessness.

Who is Tête-d'Or? At the moment of his country's imminent defeat by an invading foe he throws himself at the head of its army and saves the day. He slays the weary old king and seizes the kingship "by the right of blood." He accuses his countrymen of ignorance and subjection to women; he proposes to lead them forth out of their narrowness that they may "become acquainted with all the earth" and make it their own by "force and by possession." He crowns himself in the name of "everything as it actually is." He sets out—a grandiloquent, neurasthenic Tamburlaine—subjecting all Europe to his sway. He is about to "ascend the final step and conquer the enormous altar of Asia," when his army recoils for the first time in the face of a huge, unarmed Mongolian host. Tête-d'Or throws himself against the earth-colored men and is fatally wounded. But his army rallies and wins the battle. Over his dying form a centurion cries: "Who will establish justice among the people? The justice that rests on force?" There are minor symbolical characters and incidents the purport of which is even more obscure. The central action, however, is either a glorification of the Cæsarean madness of some man of destiny or it is nothing. The imagery becomes more and more gorgeous. It is like an army with banners. But it springs from the void and leads nowhither. For to press the apparent intention closely is to come upon something dangerously like nonsense. Tête-d'Or liberates his country from a cruel invader and then becomes an equally unscrupulous one on a larger scale. But M. Claudel is too solemn to be accused of the slightest ironic intention. Unhappily he is far from being alone in his faith—if we interpret him correctly—that the best way to crush militarism is to become thoroughly militaristic, and the best way to prevent someone else from subjecting the earth to his arbitrary tyranny is to go ahead and do it yourself. In short, "Tête-d'Or" is the product of a literary temperament of a high order, but of a confused and unguided mind.

Verner von Heidenstamm's "The Soothsayer" is a rather slight performance. But the Swedish poet's delicate frugality of execution and clearness of intention are comforting after the murky splendors of Claudel. The action of the play concerns the soothsayer Eurytus who cannot clearly hear or interpret the accents of the god because he clings too tenaciously to a human love. Thus Heidenstamm gives us a brief apologue concerning the ineffectualness of the divided spirit. A faint but steady light shines over the Greek scene the poet has chosen, and a murmur from Salamis comes to dignify and universalize the failure of the seer in his country's fateful hour.

The three one-act plays of Mr. Henry Bailey Stevens are neither very skilful in structure nor very ripe in style. But if we agree with Rémy de Gourmont that the thought is the man, and that the robes of a magnificent style will avail little if they attire a puny intellectual creature, Mr. Stevens's plays may be read with real pleasure for their substance and spirit and with the expectation of artistically maturer work to come. Where there is thought there is hope. Where, on the contrary, as in Mrs. Worthington Smith's "The Lamp of Heaven,"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decoration that is rapidly becoming purely conventional serves to drape a bit of false sentimentality, there is but little.

Mr. Winston Churchill's "Dr. Jonathan" is not a great performance either. Perhaps it is not even, absolutely considered, a good one. But no one reasonably familiar with our native war plays and post-war plays can attribute its rejection by several managers to anything but very acute artistic and political obfuscation. The play is far from being alarmingly liberal. It is simply not blind to the obvious implications of the world situation. Hence it ends with the retirement of the ultra-conservative manufacturer whose son proceeds to coöperate generously with his men on the inevitable road toward industrial democracy. Hence, too, it has an intelligently conducted secondary conflict between the manufacturer's wife and the daughter of the foreman, between the morality of a village Sunday school and that of a rational world. The dialogue of the play is somewhat conventional, the characters—especially that of the *raisonneur*, Dr. Jonathan—are didactically invented. The dramaturgic structure is far too geometrical. One suspects Mr. Churchill of having read Brieux with undue reverence. But when every objection has been duly made, the play remains by its seriousness of thought and its straight appeal to the realities of life a heartening contrast to the insufferable claptrap with which our theatres have resounded. To that claptrap there will no doubt in time be added a performance of "The Gibson Upright" by Messrs. Booth Tarkington and Harry Leon Wilson —a dramatic work that neatly combines the art of the old Bowery melodrama with the intellectual acumen of a war editorial in the *Evening Telegram*.

# Books in Brief

THOUGH Octavia Roberts (Mrs. Corneau) constantly sentimentalizes her material in "With Lafayette in America" (Houghton Mifflin) she conveys a total impression which is both picturesque and vivid. One thinks of Austin Dobson, whose "Vignettes" accomplish what she attempts. Her account of Lafayette's first coming in 1777 is a familiar matter. His five months in 1784, when he saw Washington for the last time, are briefly passed over. The second and more interesting half of Mrs. Corneau's account concerns itself with Lafayette's last visit in 1824 in response to the invitation of Congress that he be the nation's guest. His visit was in every way a national event. New York, Philadelphia, Charleston, Savannah, New Orleans, St. Louis ("the most distant point in the Republic"), Boston, and Washington vied with one another in their attempts to do him honor. Webster addressed to him, as guest of honor at the laying of the corner-stone of the Bunker Hill Monument, the famous peroration. All the small towns which he passed through fêted and entertained him. Adams, Jefferson, Jackson, and Monroe begged and received visits from him. His triumphal passage through the various States was filled with balls, theatres, parades, Indian dances and Indian huts, slave songs, shipwreck, travel by coach, travel by boat, "elegant repasts," laurel wreaths dropped upon his head by descending eagles, "literary receptions," and a toast from the President of the United States. Only sixty-seven at the time, he was not a little chagrined to find that everywhere public speakers addressed him as "venerable Sir" or "aged warrior." Even Henry Clay, as Speaker of the House of Representatives, reminded him that his visit was like a return from the dead: "You are in the midst of posterity." It was left to the Indians on the Chattahoochee, whose reservation he visited, to be the first not to tell him he had grown old. Just before his final departure a bill was introduced in Congress voting a gift of $2,000,000 to Lafayette "for his important services and expenditures during the American Revolution." The bill passed unanimously in the Senate and with only twenty-six dissenting voices in the House. Popular opinion ran so high against the wilful twenty-six who kept the vote from being unanimous that they called on Lafayette in a body to assure him that their objection was technical not personal. He set the seal upon his popularity by receiving them cordially and assuring them that had he been one of their colleagues the dissenting vote would have numbered twenty-seven.

IN comparison with Joseph Warton's voluminous discount of Pope more than a hundred and fifty years ago, or with Lord Byron's fierce championship a good half century later, Professor J. W. Mackail's recent Leslie Stephen Lecture entitled "Pope" (Cambridge University Press) is diffident, pale, and not conspicuously unified. Warton's head at least was full of a poetical system into which Pope had to be fitted; Byron's heart at least was stung by Wordsworth and Bowles into convulsive sympathy with the neglected little master. Professor Mackail, who always talks better about Latin poetry than about English, has not been full enough of Pope to discharge a conviction concerning him that will convince. "For Pope at his finest," he says,"—by which I mean, at his poetically highest—we have to go not to the Satires and Epistles, but to the work of his early and middle period; oftener than is generally realized, to his earlier poems." That readers may be saved the labor of searching this early and middle work for beauties unknown before, passages are brought forward from the "Pastorals," the "Thebaid," "Windsor Forest," "The Temple of Fame," and "The Dunciad," where according to Professor Mackail, "there is a beauty of melody, a clear flame of imagination, such as seldom recurs" in the Satires and Epistles. But precisely at this point emerges the reason why the Satires and Epistles are Pope's best poetry. The passages brought forward are not poetically high; they are only, as might have been expected, ambitiously vague, and the flame of imagination in them is not clear. Whether the Satires and Epistles are high is unimportant when it is considered that they are inimitable and probably forever unique. Professor Mackail supposes in Pope a genius for noble expression which, being early thwarted, turned and poisoned his life. It dirtied his life, as all know, but it made his poetry; for, regrettably or not, the essence of Pope's poetry is poison. His most perfect lines, like other great poets' perfect lines, are more than lines; they are worlds, with atmospheres. When one comes, in the portrait of Sporus, to

> This painted child of dirt that stinks and stings,

it is as if a phial had been overturned and deadly fumes were filling space. No such miracle is performed in the depths of Windsor Forest. Pope must have his due, if it is the Devil's.

ALL of Donne's prose that can engage the present generation seems to be contained in the "Letters" published twenty years ago by Edmund Gosse and in a volume of the "Sermons: Selected Passages" (Clarendon Press) edited now by Logan Pearsall Smith. Of the few persons equipped to challenge the specimens which Mr. Smith has brought from the interior of Donne's dark folios no one will seriously object to their brevity, convinced though he may be in general that the plundering of old prose for its purple is almost as sorry an occupation as unravelling old poems for the gold thread of their best lines or killing an old blackbird for his one red feather. Mr. Smith would have done better to quote a single sermon whole, if only to prove, what he is content with asserting, that Donne does not deserve to be so quoted. This is practically true; but assurance may be desired that the Dean of St. Paul's has been more than tasted for his metaphors. The temptation, when one is writing about the very definite grandeurs of seventeenth century prose, to fall back upon vaguely grand phrases, is a temptation which Mr. Smith has not resisted perfectly in his introductory essay, though he has well summed up there Donne's known traits as a preacher. The selections which follow, virtually inaccessible until now, will place their author high among English writers of prose from Hooker to Dryden.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The best of them have the tension and poise of poetry; the worst show Donne, not as a mediocre dialectician, for he was not even that, but as a tremendous poet temporarily astray. Donne's mediæval imagination burned no less fiercely at fifty, between the monsters Time and Eternity, than it had burned at twenty, between inexplicable Love and Hate.

ARTISTIC anatomy to the average art student spells weariness and vexation of spirit. His imagination, brooding restlessly on creative visions, is benumbed by the very appearance of most of the books which attempt to envisage the subject of anatomy with the artist's problems mainly in mind. Only with difficulty can such books be distinguished from purely scientific treatises. The diagrams of bones and muscles are badly arranged for comparative study, and they are accompanied by hundreds of pages of tedious explanatory text. Certain very recent books, however, are making praiseworthy attempts to adapt themselves more intelligently to the artist's point of view. Their tendency is to reduce the text to a minimum and to present the illustrative matter in a more attractive form. This has been done by James M. Dunlop in his "Anatomical Diagrams for the Use of Art Students" (Macmillan), a useful compendium which the art student will welcome because of its conciseness and the rare value of its arrangement. Its arrangement is its chief merit. A full-page diagram of the bony structure of the figure, or a portion of it, is placed for ready reference in juxtaposition with a corresponding diagram showing how the muscles and their attachments are laid over the bones. This saves time; for in most books the student has to paw over widely separated pages in order to make his comparative notes. The text of the book has been sedulously pruned to the barest essentials; and as the pictures themselves are colored in such a way as to appeal directly to the eye, there is little else needed in the way of explanation. It is too bad that so useful a book could not have enlarged its scope to include a supplement containing an adequate series of photographic studies and drawings in light and shade from the model. This supplement would suggest vividly to the student just how the underlying forms affect surface contours—those contours which it is his life-concern to render.

A TERRIBLE chapter of Jewish suffering is in the course of writing in eastern Europe. The intolerance and oppression which it was fondly dreamed would die a natural death with the old order of things has burst into a fiercer flame than has been witnessed in modern times. A world fed full of horrors listens almost apathetically to tales of atrocity a thousandth part of which only a few years ago would have set it aghast. It is not yet possible to speak of these things in cold blood, and the Jew is constrained to stifle his cries lest he irritate his neighbor by too much complaining. Some of this constraint is felt in Mr. M. E. Ravage's "The Jew Pays" (Knopf). The only note of bitterness is that which is suggested by the title, and it is misleading as to the contents of the book. For it is not a harrowing story of desolation, famine, and massacre. The results of the war for the Jews of eastern Europe are indicated briefly and with restraint; the bulk of the volume is an account of the measures taken by American Jews to bring a modicum of relief to their distressed co-religionists. It tells in a very readable manner of the organization of the great money-raising campaigns, of the difficulties that had to be overcome to secure the harmonious coöperation of elements in Judaism which had been living in mutual distrust and aloofness, and of the problems involved in the distribution of the vast sums. It is a tribute to the organizing skill, the personal tact, and the devoted enthusiasm of men like Mr. Jacob Billikopf, to the princely generosity of Mr. Julius Rosenwald and Mr. Nathan Strauss, to the ready response of rich and poor, to the Christians of America who eagerly caught at an opportunity to prove their good will toward their Jewish neighbors, in short, to use the words of Mr. Ravage's dedication, "to the millions of Americans—Jews and non-Jews—who have cheerfully given of their plenty and often submitted to sacrifices in order that the unfortunate of distant lands might live."

BOOK after book adds something new to the fabric which memory is weaving for the New England past. That section, once the home of the austerest Americans, now has the largest share of cultivated dilettantes; once the most forward-looking, it is now the most given to antiquarian researches. Mr. Albert G. Robinson, out of his large collection of photographs, has published a gracious and charming volume, "Old New England Doorways" (Scribners), which all lovers of New England will want to see. The modest preface makes few claims for the book, for which the pictures do all the speaking necessary. The unity of design found not only in these but in the doorways of all the colonies must be traced, Mr. Robinson points out, to the debt the eighteenth century owed to certain British books on carpentry, particularly those of Batty Langley. These designs, generally executed in stone in England, in the colonies were adapted with discretion in the handling of new materials and with marked delicacy of proportion. Salem and Portsmouth, homes of the opulent ship captains, have many of the finest specimens, but on the whole, Mr. Robinson thinks, the area richest in fine old doorways is the Connecticut Valley, from the Sound to Vermont. This bears out the feeling of the reviewer, who wishes that the collection might have afforded more space to certain sparer, barer types of doorways to be found here and there on windy Connecticut hills and in and out of the Berkshires in communities not quite so prosperous as most of those here represented. There was a time when every village, to judge by the memorials surviving, had at least one builder with taste and love for his work, and the fact is very important. We shall never understand the New England of the classical days until we have some understanding of the taste and instinct for craftsmanship which, long before 1830, already existed there among the population generally.

"THE Historical Trees of Massachusetts" (Marshall Jones), by James Raymond Simmons, does little with a tempting theme. At best trivial, the text is often silly, particularly in its straining to find historicity where none is. For Mr. Simmons almost all Massachusetts history is battles and preparing for battles, and Washington made nearly all of it by stopping here and there beneath oaks and elms. The chief literary distinction about the book is to be found in its poetical quotations, a few of which come from so unexpected a source as Herman Melville. But Mr. Simmons knows his trees, and has a genuine feeling for the part they play in human life. As a handbook of famous Massachusetts trees, with statistics concerning their size and condition, this very handsome volume has its use. And no one need apologize for adding another to the honors of such ancient heroes as the Plymouth lindens, the Endicott pear tree, the Concord willow, the Sheffield elm, the Deerfield and Sunderland buttonwoods, the Oliver Wendell Holmes pine, and the amazing apple tree at Marshfield Hills.

# Drama

## Toward a People's Theatre

THE rigid mind resists art. Not, to be sure, all the arts. In music, where medium and substance are identical, each temperament may catch the echo of its own mood. One man, listening to the andante of Beethoven's twenty-third sonata (Op. 37), will hear the austere resignation of a great and lonely mind, another will interpret that majesty and sweetness in a different fashion and see the sky break and show the silver of angelic plumage. But literature is built upon ideas and the drama projects ideas in terms of concrete living. Thus the same people will patronize good music and flock to foolish plays. They are capable of hearing the Symphonia Eroica in the afternoon and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

going in the evening to see the latest melodrama by Channing Pollock or Elmer Rice in which a foreign villain assails the virtue of American women and is foiled by some pure and heroic district attorney. Or, under the influence of a quite transitory Idol of the Tribe, they are willing to be edified by a third-rate Belgian actor's violent mouthing of the remote, white loveliness of Albert Samain's verses. But if Allan Monkhouse's "Mary Broome" were to be brought from Grand Street to Broadway their resistance to it would be complete and final.

This rigidness of mind is neither voluntary nor conscious. It is an instinctive weapon of defense that belongs to definite groups in the social and economic order. The healthy and comfortable husband, unless he is a born thinker, resents a criticism of marriage; the prosperous business man, criticism of the methods of trade; the self-satisfied father, criticism of parental authority and wisdom. The possessor resists change. To him truth is indeed pragmatic. How can you expect him to endure a vital questioning of all the truths that he has found to pay so well? If he pretends to culture he is willing to be mildly imaginative, and hence the feebler kind of neo-romantic play occasionally interrupts the spiritual sordidness of our theatre. He will lionize the author of "The Bluebird" or of "The Faithful." The author of "Man and Superman" or of "The Sunken Bell" would fare but ill. He faintly respects the classic writers because the possessive orders against which they rebelled have long been swept away. He would be shocked and suspicious if you told him that, in a period of reaction, John Milton was once pursued for sedition and for having conspired against the government like any ragged communist in yesterday's raid by the Department of Justice. But he is really neither vicious nor stupid. His possessions possess him, and, like Wagner's dragon, he desires to sleep.

These are platitudes. But they are eternal and eternally forgotten. Their acceptance is confused by isolated exceptions of various kinds—the mental flexibility of a small crowd of Londoners in Shakespeare's time, the revolt of an occasional aristocrat like Shelley. But such exceptions do not touch the central fact. Art arises from hunger—hunger for beauty or harmony or truth or justice. Even when art heals a dissonance, that dissonance must first have been perceived. How, then, can it speak to those who are convinced that they hold beauty and truth and justice in the hollow of their hand? And today, as never before, and in the drama as in no other art, the great hunger which is also the great rebellion and the great striving to remould the world a little nearer to the heart's desire, vibrates in every voice. Hence our theatre must seek another audience than that of the possessors merely. It is not necessary to have any romantic or sentimental illusions about the people; it is quite necessary to remember that among the possessing classes there are many minds that are deeply troubled and divided. But to watch the audiences in our fashionable theatres in the mass is to know that here all hope must be left behind. These people insist on being confirmed in all they have and are. It is a popular error that they are tired. They are magnificently fit and fresh. They have dined and need no food; they possess all the truth they need and want no art. What is left? A thrilling yarn of offenders against their order who are crushed, or clowns, or dancing girls. Therefore the theatre must go to those whose world is not complete and perfect, who feel some lack of beauty or justice, whose hunger is akin to the hunger of the creative artist himself, who do not go to the table of art in an equal repletion of body and of soul.

This people's theatre will not and must not be a huge place. It should consist of many small stages in different streets and cities. Its accessories can be simple, since the majority of its productions will require only ordinary modern interiors. It should not charge more than one dollar and a half for any seat and it need not, in small houses, charge less than a dollar for any. It must begin with professional actors, but one of its chief aims should be to find and train gifted persons who shall


ALFRED A. KNOPF 220 W. 42 St., NEW YORK

**BOLSHEVIK RUSSIA**

By ETIENNE ANTONELLI

*Translated from the French by CHARLES A. CARROLL*

Here is a book on Russia which is so different from anything that has been done on the subject before that the liberals of America *must* instantly recognize it as the book they have been waiting, looking for. It is *not* another "personal experience" story (although the author, as French military attaché in Russia during the Revolution, participated in the events which he describes) but a thorough study of the theory and practice of Bolshevism and the psychology of the movement and its leaders. It is honest, fair and unbiased; that is its great claim to distinction.

"A most important and valuable contribution to the history of the Revolution. The aim of the author has been to present the actual facts, supported wherever possible, by reproductions of original documents in an objective, historical spirit, and he has succeeded admirably."—*London Daily Herald.* $2.00 *net.*

**HELIOGABALUS**

A Buffoonery

By H. L. MENCKEN and GEORGE JEAN NATHAN

A limited edition only has been published of this very amusing three-act play by Messrs. Mencken and Nathan, consisting of two thousand numbered copies, printed from type. The entire edition has now (January 8) been sold to the booksellers, in advance of publication. You should order at once from your bookseller. $2.00 *net.*

Sixty copies have been printed on Imperial Japan Vellum bound in half parchment and autographed by the authors. Of these fifty only are for sale at $10.00 *net.*

**THE SECRET BATTLE**

By A. P. HERBERT

is in the opinion of the best English critics the finest war novel that England has produced. It should interest very especially readers of *The Nation.* It is a book that will not, probably, be widely popular; but it will be remarkable if the political liberals of this country—as well as those who rejoice in a fine bit of writing for its own sake—do not welcome it enthusiastically.

"The first war novel to clear away all that is spectacular in the war, and to find in it a theme of general and artistic, as apart from historical interest. It is the simple narrative of an ordinary man, yet somehow so transmuted by an unusual literary gift as to become almost impeccable as literature—one of the most remarkable books that the war has produced, one that can hardly fail to outlive the majority of its competitors."—*The Westminster Gazette.* $1.75 *net.*

*P. S.—About* ***JOSEPH HERGESHEIMER'S*** *books: ¶LINDA CONDON. "Incomparably the finest and loveliest of Hergesheimer's novels."—James Branch Cabell in The Bookman. ¶MOUNTAIN BLOOD, a novel of the Virginia mountains today, and THE LAY ANTHONY, a romance, have been reissued in revised editions. ¶THE HAPPY END contains seven fine short stories. Then there are JAVA HEAD, a novel of old Salem, and THE THREE BLACK PENNYS, of the early iron furnaces of Pennsylvania; and GOLD AND IRON, three short novels.*


LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be willing to practice their beautiful art on modest but regular salaries and hold this worthier than the alternate affluence and squalor of the average actor of the commercial stage. It must have, above all, excellent producing managers. Several little theatres among us that might have become starting-points of a movement toward a folk theatre fail through the eccentricity and incompetence of their producing management. The stages of the People's Theatre will have no room and no time for Cubist decorations or the plays of young persons who have just escaped from a campus and mistake singularity for freedom and distinction.

The production of Allan Monkhouse's "Mary Broome" at the Neighborhood Playhouse is a noteworthy example of what a People's Theatre can do even under untoward conditions. The stage management, under the direction of Mr. Iden Payne, is excellent. But the payers are all amateurs. Yet when it is considered that these young people work for their livelihood during the week, rehearse at night, and play on Saturday and Sunday, the result is astonishing. They have the sense of the theatre and they have the sense of life. Several of them, especially Mr. S. B. Tobias, Miss Ida Schiff, Miss Helen Curry, and Miss Helen Rosenthal, put themselves into their parts with extraordinary sensitiveness and flexibility. And they do so, one suspects, because to them, far more than to the professional actor of Broadway, the form and content of the art of the drama is an immediate and a native experience of the mind and heart.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

# Art

## Illustration in Rapid Survey

EVERY one concerned with the publication of illustrated books, magazines, and papers, whether artist or engraver, printer or publisher, or even the outside public, should have been compelled to visit the exhibition of illustrated books just ended at the New York Public Library. In the art of illustration we have gone backward, not forward. In the seventies and eighties we had the right appreciation for it, we strove for perfection, and by the nineties we were in the van of the movement; our illustrated books and magazines held their own with those of any other country; we showed that to reject the methods of the past was not necessarily to substitute nothing good in their place. Our wood engravers gave to the artists whose work they reproduced a facility never enjoyed before, and this facility was increased by process when the right use was made of it. And now? A glance at the bookstalls should humiliate us with their eloquent proof of the banality and incompetence into which we have tumbled.

At the Library, the achievement of the centuries since the invention of printing was shown in rapid survey. From the beginning it could be seen how the artist was ever striving for greater freedom in expressing himself, his conventions (as they may seem to us) being the result of the limitations under which he worked, while the wood-cutter—when the artist did not cut his own drawings—and the printer were striving on their part to lessen these limitations and allow him the freedom he sought. First, wood-cutting was the illustrator's one medium, and the exhibition included some of the finest early examples—the Hypternomachia, Dürer's Little Passion, Holbein's Dance of Death. Then, gradually, metal engraving superseded the earlier methods, eventually giving the artist the chance he had in the books of the eighteenth century illustrated by Boucher, Moreau, Gravelot. The nineteenth century brought with it less expensive methods. For a while lithography prevailed, though, but for an example or two of Gavarni, Isabey's fine St. Jean à Thiers, and Delacroix's illustrations for "Faust" and "Macbeth," the Library gave little idea of what was done in it. At much the same period Bewick was reviving the possibilities of the wood-cut in England. Then came the school of wood-engravers who reproduced the German Menzel and the French men of the thirties, none of these as well represented as they should be. And so we reach the sixties, the Golden Age of illustration, as the period has been called. Here the Library was rich in characteristic examples—Rossetti's illustrations for Allingham and Christina Rossetti and Millais's for the Parables, Sandys' Old Chartist and Whistler's Morning before the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, this last shown both in proof and on the page of *Once a Week*. It is in the more modern work that the collection was weakest. Illustration in France toward the end of the nineteenth century was almost ignored. Lepère was there. But what of Steinlen, Willette, Carlos Schwabe, Renouard, Toulouse, Lautrec, and a host of others? And are we to overlook the great and beautiful work done in England by Charles Keene? Beardsley was included, but what of E. J. Sullivan? If Anning Bell was prominent, why not Ricketts and Shannon, who are no more derivative than he? And when it came to America, how much did the collection suggest of the wonderful development in the art of wood-engraving made by Cole and Jungling, Closson and Wolf? Of the fine work done by the leading American illustrators of the last quarter of the last century? It would have been better to hold two exhibitions, for it is from the work of this period that we could learn most of use to us in these days of the degradation of illustration.

Lithography, in the course of time, was denounced and, indeed, because of its cheapness fell to commercial depths that disgusted artists with a beautiful art to which only of late years have they ventured to return. Wood-engraving as Cole and Wolf practised it was also denounced, modern mediævalists like Morris and Crane seeing damnation in it. Photo-engraving at first was denounced by purists who would rather have had their drawings travestied by the poorest wood-engraver than faithfully reproduced by a mechanical process. And yet all these methods were invented or improved that the artist might profit by them. The artist was still the first consideration as he had been in the days of Dürer and Holbein, Moreau and Gravelot, Menzel and Delacroix. The artist made the drawing and the drawing was the important thing. Engraver and printer were subservient to him, though all three worked together to give the public the best the methods at their disposal could produce. But now the artist is of the least consideration. Cheapness is the ideal of the publisher, and the artist costs money. Also, the publisher, or the editor, is bent on giving the public what he decides the public wants. Here, really, is the cause of the great gap between the periodicals with flaming covers that litter our bookstalls and the illustrated publications of the days that followed the reaction from the earlier "Gems" and "Opals," "Talismans" and "Forget-Me-Nots." We fancy we have gone far ahead of these old albums and gift books, but in them the artist was still a necessary evil. We laugh at *Godey's Lady's Book*, but where is the magazine today that gives us more beautiful color prints of the passing fashions? The truth is, we have gone back in this respect, and the more exhibitions we have in which to see ourselves as we really are, the better it will be for us.

N. N.

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

*We buy old, rare books, and sets of books*

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# International Relations Section

## Russian Soviet Peace Offers*

THE Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Government, through the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, has made repeated attempts to bring about peace and commercial relations with the Allied and Associated Powers—the United States, England, France, Italy, and Japan. No one of these efforts, however, has been successful. The Allied Governments have so far refused to enter into any negotiations with the Russian Government except such as relate solely to the exchange of prisoners.

The following is a summary of the communications of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs regarding peace, so far as they are known to the office of the Representative in the United States of the Russian Soviet Republic. No one of them has been acknowledged or answered by the Allied and Associated Powers.

1. August 5, 1918. The People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, M. Chicherin, presented to Mr. Poole, United States Consul General, a communication requesting him to inform the Russian Government of the objects of the Government of Great Britain in the invasion by British troops of Russian territory in the Murmansk region and at Archangel, and asking him to ascertain on what terms the Government of Great Britain would discontinue its invasion of Russia.

2. October 17, 1918. M. Chicherin attempted to enter into negotiations with representatives of the Allied and Associated Powers in regard to peace and the resumption of friendly relations through the Norwegian Minister to Russia.

3. October 24, 1918. On the occasion of his leaving Moscow, M. Christiansen, an attaché of the Norwegian Legation, was given a note from M. Chicherin for transmission to President Wilson. This note offered an immediate armistice with the Allies on condition of the evacuation of occupied Russian territory by Allied troops, during which peace negotiations were to begin.

4. November 3, 1918. M. Chicherin, through the representatives of neutral countries who were still in Russia at the time, tendered an official offer to the Governments of the Allied and Associated Powers to open negotiations with a view to arriving at an understanding.

5. November 7, 1918. This offer was approved by the Sixth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, which made formal declaration of the desire of the Russian people to enter into peace negotiations with the Entente nations and gave to the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs the power necessary to carry out this desire, authorizing it on its own initiative to undertake new steps in that direction.

6. December 3, 1918. M. Chicherin dispatched a radio message addressed to the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, protesting against military intervention in Russia by the Allied Powers. In this note M. Chicherin emphasized the desire of the Russian Soviet Government for peace, and for immediate negotiations to that end. "The Russian Republic has offered peace to the Entente countries, but the Governments of the latter have left this offer unanswered. Their answer is the present new aggression. The Socialist Soviet Republic is always ready, as before, to make peace."

7. December 23, 1918. M. Litvinov, Representative of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs at Stockholm, Sweden, sent an identic note to the representatives at Stockholm of the Allied and Associated Governments, offering to open preliminary negotiations in order to eliminate all the causes leading to the continuance of military operations against Russia.

8. December 24, 1918. In addition to the identic note handed to the United States Ambassador at Stockholm, M. Litvinov dispatched a note by wireless to President Woodrow Wilson, at that time in London. This communication offered an immediate understanding with the United States Government, stating that "most points in your peace program are included in the more extensive aspirations of the Russian workers and peasants."

9. January 12, 1919. M. Litvinov, in behalf of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, transmitted to the State Department of the United States a note declaring the wish of the Russian Government to reëstablish normal relations with the United States and stating that "we are ready to eliminate everything which may be an obstacle to such relations." The occasion for this note was a statement by Mr. Hitchcock, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, of the reasons underlying the presence of the United States troops in Russia. M. Litvinov attempted to point out that none of the reasons given was pertinent at that time.

10. January 14, 1919. The People's Commissariat once more informed the Russian representative at Stockholm of the readiness of the Russian Government to begin negotiations with the Governments of the Entente Powers for the purpose of reaching an understanding.

11. January 17, 1919. The Russian Government dispatched a radio communication to the Governments of the Allied and Associated Powers asking them when and by what method intervention in Russia would be terminated, and how soon negotiations would be commenced with this end in view. The occasion for this note was an alleged refusal of the French Government to intervene further in Russia, mentioned in a resolution of the *Confédération Générale du Travail.*

12. February 4, 1919. M. Chicherin dispatched a note to the Allied Governments in answer to a reported invitation, sent out by these Governments to all the *de facto* Governments of Russia, to a conference at Prinkipo. (No such invitation had actually been received by the Russian Soviet Government.) M. Chicherin, in his note, accepted the reported invitation of the Allied Powers. He made, moreover, renewed declarations of the desire of his Government for peace and friendly relations, and offered the following basis for immediate negotiations: (1) assumption of financial obligations of former régimes, (2) payment of interest on its loans in raw materials, (3) concessions in mines, forests, and other resources, (4) territorial concessions. The Prinkipo conference was never held and no acknowledgment of this note was ever made.

13. February 14, 1919. M. Chicherin dispatched a note to the Italian Government protesting against the intrigues of its agents and of the agents of other Allied Governments in Russia against the Soviet Government. In this note he reiterated the desire of the Russian Government for peace. "Now as before," he stated, "our constant desire is peace with all peoples. In order to be able to enjoy its

* The peace offers of the Russian Soviet Government published in this issue are an official compilation made by the Russian Soviet Bureau in New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

benefits we are now, as ever, ready to make serious sacrifices, which are mentioned in our note of February 4, addressed to the Powers of the Entente."

14. February 19, 1919. M. Chicherin sent a note to the Allied Governments expressing a desire to conclude peace with Poland and reiterating the hope of the Soviet Government of a friendly understanding with the Allied Powers. "The Russian Soviet Government . . . emphasizes that . . . it is animated by peaceful intentions and by its desire to eliminate all grounds of conflict with the Entente Powers."

15. March 12, 1919. M. Chicherin presented at Moscow to Mr. William C. Bullitt, special representative of the American Commissioners Plenipotentiary to negotiate peace with the Central Powers, a precise statement for transmission to the Peace Conference of the terms that the Russian Soviet Government was ready to accept as the basis for negotiations with the Allied and Associated Powers. A two weeks armistice was proposed to discuss peace on the basis of the following principles: (1) territorial *status quo* pending the decisions of the conference, (2) abolition of the blockade of Russia and equal distribution of supplies to all classes of the population, (3) use by Soviet Russia of ports of former Russian empire, (4) freedom of movement for nationals of both parties, (5) amnesty for political offenders on both sides, (6) withdrawal of Allied troops and assistance to anti-Soviet forces, (7) recognition by the Soviet Government of the debts of the former Russian Empire.

16. May 7, 1919. M. Chicherin, in his reply to Dr. Nansen's project for food relief, took occasion to reiterate the readiness of the Russian Soviet Government to enter into immediate negotiations for peace with the Allied Governments. "We were always ready to enter into peace negotiations," he stated, "and we are ready to do it now as before. We will be glad to begin discussing these questions, but of course, directly with the other belligerents—that is, with the Associated Governments or else with persons empowered by the latter."

17. October 2, 1919. M. Chicherin, in a wireless message sent broadcast, again proclaimed the desire of the Russian Government for peace. "Our intentions regarding peace," he said, "remain the same as when the Bullitt Mission arrived. We are ready to make peace at any moment, provided military operations are stopped immediately and the blockade is lifted. We have not imposed and we do not wish to impose Communism on anybody."

18. November, 1919. In the early part of November, 1919, Lieutenant Colonel Lestrang Malone, M. P., then recently returned from Moscow, made public in Great Britain the terms of a new offer of negotiations from the Russian Soviet Government which he claimed would be acceptable to the Russian Government if acted upon by Great Britain on or before November 15, 1919. The text of these terms as published in the London *Daily Herald* of November 8, 1919, is identical with that of the note presented in March by M. Chicherin to Mr. Bullitt (No. 15), with the exception of a few minor changes in phrasing necessitated by the lapse of time. (M. Litvinov, special representative of the Russian Soviet Government, at a conference at Copenhagen with Mr. O'Grady, representing the British Government, regarding an exchange of prisoners, was reported in the press as having denied that any official proposals were made through Colonel Malone).

19. December 4, 1919. M. Litvinov, in a press interview at Copenhagen was reported as stating that the proposals handed to Mr. Bullitt substantially held good.

20. December 4, 1919. Colonel Malone was reported in press dispatches to have announced that he had received an official communication from the Russian Soviet Government asking him to make public the fact that the Russian Government was still desirous of a discussion of peace terms.

21. December 5, 1919. The Seventh All-Russian Congress of Soviets, at its regular session at Moscow, passed a resolution which expressed the desire of the Soviet Republic "to live in peace with all peoples and to direct all its forces to internal construction," and offered peace to "all the Entente Powers—England, France, the United States of America, and Japan, together or separately."*

The texts of the more important communications mentioned above follow, in chronological order:

## 3 Note to President Wilson

*Mr. President:* In your message of January 8 to the Congress of the United States of North America, in the sixth point, you spoke of your profound sympathy for Russia, which was then conducting, single-handed, negotiations with the mighty German imperialism. Your program, you declared, demands the evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest coöperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her political development and national policy, and assure her a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. And you added that "the treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their goodwill, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy."

The desperate struggle which we were waging at Brest-Litovsk against German imperialism apparently only intensified your sympathy for Soviet Russia, for you sent greetings to the Congress of the Soviets, which, under the threat of a German offensive, ratified the Brest peace of violence—greetings and assurances that Soviet Russia might count upon American help.

Six months have passed since then, and the Russian people have had sufficient time to get actual tests of your Government's and your allies' goodwill, of their comprehension of the needs of the Russian people, of their intelligent, unselfish sympathy. This attitude of your Government and of your allies was shown first of all in the conspiracy which was organized on Russian territory with the financial assistance of your French allies and with the diplomatic coöperation of your Government as well—the conspiracy of the Czecho-Slovaks, to whom your Government is furnishing every kind of assistance.

For some time attempts had been made to create a pretext for a war between Russia and the United States by spreading false stories to the effect that German war prisoners had seized the Siberian railway, but your own officers, and after them Colonel Robins, the head of your Red Cross Mission, had been convinced that these allegations were absolutely false. The Czecho-Slovak conspiracy was organized under the slogan that unless these misled, unfortunate people be protected, they would be surrendered to Germany and Austria; but you may find out, among other sources, from the open letter of Captain Sadoul, of the French Military Mission, how unfounded this charge is. The Czecho-Slovaks would have left Russia in the beginning of the year had the French Government provided ships for them. For several months we have waited in vain for your allies to provide the opportunity for the Czecho-Slovaks to leave. Evidently these Governments have very much preferred the presence of the Czecho-Slovaks in Russia—the results show

* On January 7 it was reported from Stockholm that a new peace offer from the Soviet Republic to the Allies was being taken to London by Colonel Tallents, British Representative in the Baltic States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for what object—to their departure for France and their participation in the fighting on the French front. The best proof of the real object of the Czecho-Slovak rebellion is the fact that, although in control of the Siberian railway, the Czecho-Slovaks have not taken advantage of this to leave Russia, but by the order of the Entente Governments, whose directions they follow, have remained in Russia to become the mainstay of the Russian counter-revolution. Their counter-revolutionary mutiny, which made impossible the transportation of grain and petroleum on the Volga, which cut off the Russian workers and peasants from the Siberian stores of grain and other materials, and condemned them to starvation—this was the first experience of the workers and peasants of Russia with your Government and with your allies after your promises of the beginning of the year. And then came another experience; an attack on North Russia by Allied troops, including American troops, their invasion of Russian territory without any cause and without a declaration of war, the occupation of Russian cities and villages, execution of Soviet officials, and other acts of violence against the peaceful population of Russia.

You have promised, Mr. President, to coöperate with Russia in order to obtain for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her political development and her national policy. Actually, this coöperation took the form of an attempt of the Czecho-Slovak troops, and later, in Archangel, Murmansk, and the Far East, of your own and your allies' troops, to force the Russian people to submit to the rule of the oppressing and exploiting classes, whose dominion was overthrown by the workers and peasants of Russia in October, 1917. The revival of the Russian counter-revolution, which has already become a corpse, attempts to restore by force its bloody domination over the Russian people—such was the experience of the Russian people, instead of coöperation for the unembarrassed expression of their will, which you promised them, Mr. President, in your declarations.

You have also, Mr. President, promised the Russian people to assist them in their struggle for independence. Actually, this is what has occurred: while the Russian people were fighting on the southern front against the counter-revolution, which has betrayed them to German imperialism and was threatening their independence; while they were using all their energy to organize the defense of their territory against Germany at their western frontiers, they were forced to move their troops to the east to oppose the Czecho-Slovaks, who were bringing them slavery and oppression, and to the north against your allies' and your own troops, which had invaded their territory, and against the counter-revolutions organized by these troops.

Mr. President, the acid test of the relations between the United States and Russia gave quite different results from those that might have been expected from your message to the Congress. But we have reason not to be altogether dissatisfied with even these results, since the outrages of the counter-revolution in the east and north have shown the workers and peasants of Russia the aims of the Russian counter-revolution, and of its foreign supporters, thereby creating among the Russian people an iron will to defend their liberty and the conquests of the revolution, to defend the land that it has given to the peasants and the factories that it has given to the workers. The fall of Kazan, Symbyrsk, Syzran, and Samara should make clear to you, Mr. President, what were the consequences for us of the actions which followed your promises of January 18. Our trials helped us to create a strongly united and disciplined Red Army, which is daily growing stronger and more powerful, and which is learning to defend the revolution. The attitude toward us which was actually displayed by your Government and by your allies could not destroy us; on the contrary, we are now stronger than we were a few months ago, and your present proposal of international negotiations for a general peace finds us alive and strong and in a position to give in the name of Russia our consent to join the negotiations. In your note to Germany, you demand the evacuation of occupied territories as a condition which must precede the armistice during which peace negotiations shall begin. We are ready, Mr. President, to conclude an armistice on these conditions, and we ask you to notify us when you, Mr. President, and your allies intend to remove your troops from Murmansk, Archangel, and Siberia. You refuse to conclude an armistice unless Germany will stop the outrages, pillaging, etc., during the evacuation of occupied territories. We allow ourselves, therefore, to draw the conclusion that you and your allies will order the Czecho-Slovaks to return the part of our gold reserve fund which they seized in Kazan; that you will forbid them to continue as heretofore their acts of pillaging and outrages against the workers and peasants during their forced departure (for we will encourage their speedy departure, without waiting for your order).

With regard to your other peace terms, namely, that the Governments which would conclude peace must express the will of their people, you are aware that our Government fully satisfies this condition. Our Government expresses the will of the Councils of Workmen's, Peasants' and Red Army Deputies, representing at least eighty per cent. of the Russian people. This cannot, Mr. President, be said about your Government. But, for the sake of humanity and peace, we do not demand as a prerequisite of general peace negotiations that all nations participating in the negotiations shall be represented by Councils of People's Commissars elected at a Congress of Councils of Workmen's, Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies. We know that this form of government will soon be the general form, and that a general peace, when nations will no more be threatened with defeat, will leave them free to put an end to the system and the cliques that forced upon mankind this universal slaughter, and which will, in spite of themselves, surely lead the tortured peoples to create Soviet Governments that give exact expression to their will.

Agreeing to participate at present in negotiations with even such Governments as do not yet express the will of the people, we would like on our part to find out from you, Mr. President, in detail what is your conception of the League of Nations, which you propose as the crowning work of peace. You demand the independence of Poland, Serbia, Belgium, and freedom for the peoples of Austria-Hungary. You probably mean by this that the masses of the people must everywhere first become the masters of their own fate, in order to unite afterward in a league of free nations. But, strangely enough, we do not find among your demands the liberation of Ireland, Egypt, or India, or even the liberation of the Philippines, and we would be very sorry if these peoples should be denied the opportunity to participate, together with us, through their freely elected representatives, in the organization of the League of Nations.

We would also, Mr. President, very much like to know, before the negotiations with regard to the formation of a League of Nations have begun, what is your conception of the solution of many economic questions, which is essential for the cause of future peace. You do not mention the war expenditures—this unbearable burden which the masses would have to carry, unless the League of Nations should renounce payments on the loans to the capitalists of all countries. You know as well as we, Mr. President, that this war is the outcome of the policies of all capitalistic nations; that the governments of all countries were continually piling up armaments; that the ruling groups of all civilized nations pursued a policy of annexations, and that it would, therefore, be extremely unjust if the masses, having paid for these policies with millions of lives and with economic ruin, should yet pay to those who are really responsible for the war a tribute for their policies which resulted in all these countless miseries. We propose, therefore, Mr. President, the annulment of the war loans as the basis of the League of Nations As to the restoration of the countries that were laid waste by the war, we believe it is only just that all nations should in this respect aid the unfortunate Belgium, Poland, and Serbia; and however poor and ruined Russia seems to be, she

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is ready, on her part, to do everything she can to help these victims of the war, and she expects that American capital, which has not at all suffered from this war, and has even made many millions in profits out of it, will do its part to help these peoples.

But the League of Nations should not only liquidate the present war, but also make impossible any wars in the future. You must be aware, Mr. President, that the capitalists of your country are planning to apply in the future the same policies of encroachment and of super-profits in China and Siberia; and that, fearing competition from Japanese capitalists, they are preparing a military force to overcome the resistance which they may meet from Japan. You are no doubt aware of similar plans of the capitalists and ruling circles of other countries with regard to other territories and other peoples. Knowing this, you will have to agree with us that the factories, mines, and banks must not be left in the hands of private persons, who have always made use of the vast means of production created by the masses of the people to export products and capital to foreign countries, in order to reap super-profits in return for the benefits forced on them, their struggle for spoils resulting in imperialistic wars. We propose, therefore, Mr. President, that the League of Nations be based on the expropriation of the capitalists of all countries. In your country, Mr. President, the banks and the industries are in the hands of such a small group of capitalists that, as your personal friend, Colonel Robins, assured us, the arrest of twenty heads of capitalistic cliques and the transfer of control, which by characteristic capitalistic methods they have come to possess, into the hands of the masses of the world is all that would be required to destroy the principal source of new wars. If you will agree to this, Mr. President—if the sources of future wars will thus be destroyed, then there can be no doubt that it would be easy to remove all economic barriers, and that all peoples, controlling their means of production, will be vitally interested in exchanging the things they do not need for the things they need. It will then be a question of an exchange of products between nations, each of which produces what it can best produce, and the League of Nations will be a league of mutual aid of the toiling masses. It will then be easy to reduce the armed forces to the limit necessary for the maintenance of internal safety.

We know very well that the selfish capitalist class will attempt to create this internal menace, just as the Russian landlords and capitalists are now attempting, with the aid of American, English, and French armed forces, to take the factories from the workers and the land from the peasants. But if the American workers, inspired by your idea of a League of Nations, will crush the resistance of the American capitalist, as we have crushed the resistance of the Russian capitalists, then neither the German nor any other capitalists will be a serious menace to the victorious working class, and it will then suffice if every member of the commonwealth, working six hours in the factory, spends two hours daily for several months in learning the use of arms, so that the whole people will know how to overcome the internal menace.

And so, Mr. President, though we have had experience with your promises, we nevertheless accept as a basis your proposals about peace and about a League of Nations. We have tried to develop them in order to avoid results which would contradict your promises, as was the case with your promise of assistance to Russia. We have tried to formulate with precision your proposals on the League of Nations in order that the League of Nations should not turn out to be a league of capitalists against the nations. Should you not agree with us, we have no objection to an "open discussion of your peace terms" as the first point of your peace program demands. If you will accept our proposals as a basis, we will easily agree on the details.

But there is another possibility. We have had dealings with the President of the Archangel attack and the Siberian invasion, and we have also had dealings with the President of the League of Nations peace program. Is not the first of these—the real President—actually directing the policies of the American capitalist Government? Is not the American Government rather a government of the American corporations, of the American industrial, commercial, and railroad trusts, of the American banks—in short a government of the American capitalists? And is it not possible that the proposals of this Government about the creation of a League of Nations will result in new chains for the peoples, in the organization of an international trust for the exploitation of the workers and the suppression of weak nations? In this latter case, Mr. President, you will not be in a position to reply to our questions, and we will say to the workers of all countries: Beware! Millions of your brothers, thrown at each other's throats by the bourgeoisie of all countries, are still perishing on the battle fields, and the capitalist leaders are already trying to come to an understanding for the purpose of suppressing with united forces those that remain alive, when they call to account the criminals who caused the war!

However, Mr. President, since we do not at all desire to wage war against the United States, even though your Government has not yet been replaced by a Council of People's Commissars, and your post is not yet taken by Eugene Debs, whom you have imprisoned; since we do not at all desire to wage war against England, even though the Cabinet of Mr. Lloyd George has not yet been replaced by a Council of People's Commissars, with MacLean at its head; since we have no desire to wage war against France, even though the capitalist Government of Clemenceau has not yet been replaced by a workmen's Government of Merheim; just as we have concluded peace with the imperialistic Government of Germany, with Emperor William at its head, from whom you, Mr. President, feel as alien as we, the Workmen's and Peasants' Revolutionary Government, from you—we finally propose to you, Mr. President, that you take up with your allies the following questions and give us precise and definite replies: Do the Governments of the United States, England, and France consent to cease demanding the blood of the Russian people and the lives of R.ssian citizens, if the Russian people will agree to pay them a ransom such as a man who has been suddenly attacked pays to the one who attacked him? If so, just what tribute do the Governments of the United States, England, and France demand of the Russian people? Do they demand concessions; that the railways, mines, gold deposits, etc., shall be handed over to them on certain conditions, or do they demand territorial concessions, some part of Siberia or Caucasia, or perhaps the Murmansk Coast? We expect from you, Mr. President, that you will definitely state just what you and your allies demand, and also whether the alliance between your Government and the Governments of the other Entente Powers is in the nature of a combination which could be compared with a corporation for drawing dividends from Russia, or do your Government and the other Governments of the Entente Powers have each separate and special demands, and what are they? Particularly are we interested to know the demands of your French allies with regard to the three billions of rubles which the Paris bankers loaned to the Government of the Czar—the oppressor of Russia and the enemy of his own people. And you, Mr. President, as well as your French allies, surely know that even if you and your allies should succeed in enslaving and covering with blood the whole territory of Russia—which will not be allowed by our heroic revolutionary Red Army—that even in that case the Russian people, worn out by the war and not having had sufficient time to take advantage of the benefits of the Soviet rule to elevate their national economy, will be unable to pay to the French bankers the full tribute for the billions that were used by the Government of the Czar for purposes injurious to the people. Do your French allies demand that a part of this tribute be paid in installments, and, if so, what part, and do they not anticipate that their claims will result in similar claims by other creditors of the infamous Government of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Czar, which has been overthrown by the Russian people? We can hardly think that your Government and your allies are without a ready answer, when your and their troops are trying to advance on our territory with the evident object of seizing and enslaving our country. The Russian people, through the people's Red Army, are guarding their territory and are bravely fighting against your invasion and against the attacks of your allies. But your Government and the Governments of the other Powers of the Entente, undoubtedly, have well-prepared plans, for the sake of which you are shedding the blood of your soldiers. We expect that you will state your demands very clearly and definitely. Should we, however, be disappointed; should you fail to reply to our quite definite and precise questions, we will draw the only possible conclusion—that we are justified in the assumption that your Government and the Governments of your allies desire to get from the Russian people a tribute both in money and in natural resources of Russia, and territorial concessions as well. We will tell this to the Russian people, as well as to the toiling masses of other countries, and the absence of a reply from you will serve for us as a silent reply. The Russian people will then understand that the demands of your Government and of the Governments of your allies are so severe and vast that you do not even want to communicate them to the Russian Government.

CHICHERIN,
*People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs*

## 8 Second Note to President Wilson

*Mr. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, American Embassy, London. Mr. President:* In addition to general peace offer recently addressed by the Soviet Government to the Allies, I formally informed today the Stockholm Ministers of the United States and of Allied countries that I am authorized to enter into negotiations for a peaceful settlement of all questions making for hostilities against Russia.

The principles proclaimed by you as possible basis for settling European questions, and your avowed efforts and intentions of making settlement conform to demands of justice and humanity, induce and justify me to send you this statement, inasmuch as most points of your peace program are included in the more extensive aspirations of the Russian workers and peasants, now rulers of their country. It was they who first proclaimed and actually granted to nations right of self-determination, who suffered most sacrifices in fighting imperialism and militarism both at home and abroad, who dealt severest blow to secret diplomacy and inaugurated open diplomacy. And it was partly for these innovations in politics that they have been fiercely attacked by the former ruling classes of Russia and their counterparts in other countries.

To justify this attack a network of lies and calumnies has been woven round the activities of the Soviets, and forged documents put into circulation. Unfortunately, Allied statesmen accept all monstrous accusations against Soviets at face value without taking trouble to check them. While agents of anti-Soviet parties are allowed and encouraged to move freely in Allied countries and disseminate untruth, representatives of the accused side have never been allowed to put fully their case and to answer charges made against them.

In fact the chief aim of the Soviets is to secure for the toiling majority of Russian people economic liberty without which political liberty is of no avail to them. For eight months the Soviets endeavored to realize their aims by peaceful methods without resorting to violence, adhering to the abolition of capital punishment, which abolition had been part of their program. It was only when their adversaries, the minority of the Russian people, took to terroristic acts against popular members of the Government and invoked the help of foreign troops, that the laboring masses were driven to acts of exasperation and gave vent to their wrath and bitter feelings against their former oppressors. For Allied invasion of Russian territory not only compelled the Soviets against their own will to militarize the country anew and to divert their energies and resources so necessary to the economic reconstruction of Russia, exhausted by four years of war, to the defense of the country, but also cut off the vital sources of foodstuffs and raw material, exposing the population to most terrible privation bordering on starvation.

I wish to emphasize that the so-called red terror, which is grossly exaggerated and misrepresented abroad, was not the cause but the direct outcome and result of Allied intervention. The Russian workers and peasants fail to understand how foreign countries, which never dreamt of interfering with Russian affairs when Czarist barbarism and militarism ruled supreme, and which even supported that régime, feel justified in intervening in Russia now when the working people itself, after decades of strenuous struggling and countless sacrifices, succeeded in taking power and destiny of their country into their own hands, aiming at nothing but their own happiness and international brotherhood, constituting no menace to other nations.

The Russian workers and peasants are determined to defend their dearly-won power and liberties against invaders with all the means their vast country puts at their disposal. But mindful of the inevitable wanton loss of life and treasure on both sides and wishing to avert the further ruining of Russia, which must result from the continuation of internal and external fighting, they are prepared to go to any length of concessions as far as real interests of other countries are concerned, if they can secure thereby conditions enabling them to work out peacefully their social schemes.

I understand that the question of relations with Russia is now engaging the attention of Allied statesmen. I venture then to submit to you, Mr. President, that there are now only two courses open to them. One is continued open or disguised intervention on the present or on a still larger scale, which means prolongation of war, further embitterment of the Russian masses, intensification of internal strife, unexampled bloodshed and perhaps total extermination of the Russian bourgeoisie by the exasperated masses, final devastation of the country, and in case of the interventionists after a long struggle obtaining their end, a white terror eclipsing the atrocities of the Finnish White Guards, inevitable introduction of military dictatorship and restoration of monarchy, leading to interminable revolutions and upheavals, and paralyzing the economic development of the country for long decades.

The other alternative, which I trust may commend itself to you, is impartially to weigh and investigate into the one-sided accusations against Soviet Russia; to come to an understanding with the Soviet Government; to withdraw the foreign troops from Russian territory and to raise the economic blockade, soothing thereby the excited passions of the masses; to help Russia to regain her own sources of supply and to give her technical advice how to exploit her natural richness in most effective way for the benefit of all countries badly in need of foodstuffs and raw materials.

The dictatorship of toilers and producers is not an aim in itself, but the means of building up a new social system under which useful work and equal rights would be provided for all citizens irrespective of classes to which they had formerly belonged. One may believe in this ideal or not, but it surely gives no justification for sending foreign troops to fight against it, or for arming and supporting classes interested in the restoration of the old system of exploitation of man by man.

I venture to appeal to your sense of justice and impartiality. I hope and trust above all that before deciding on any course of action you will give justice to the demand of *audiatur et altera pars.*

MAXIM LITVINOV
*Late Representative for Great Britain of the Russian Federative Republic, Stockholm, December 24, 1918*

## 9 Note to State Department

On behalf of M. Chicherin, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, I am sending you the following statement:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A radio telegram from Washington, received via Lyons on the 12th of January, relates that a statement has been made by Senator Hitchcock, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, about the causes for the sending of American troops to Russia. The principal cause is said to have been a desire to prevent the establishment of a German submarine base in Archangel. Whether there ever has been such a cause or not, it does not exist any more.

In respect to the second alleged cause for the invasion, namely, that the intention was to safeguard Allied supplies in Archangel, I beg to remind you that even last year we had started negotiations for this purpose, and we are now still willing to enter into a satisfactory solution of this question. There can no longer be any danger of the supplies falling into German hands.

The third reason for the invasion was stated to be a desire to maintain an open way for diplomatic representatives travelling from and to Russia. I beg to call your attention to the fact that the best method to attain this aim would be to have an understanding with my Government. Mr. Francis, the American Ambassador, was quite free to return to his homeland unhindered at the time he left Russia. Our only cause in asking him not to remain in Vologda was the great danger threatening his personal security, and we offered him particularly inviting quarters in or around Moscow.

The fourth alleged ground for the invasion is the protection of the Czecho-Slovaks. Yet there has never been any obstacle to reaching an understanding about this issue with my Government. We have officially offered the Czecho-Slovaks free passage to their homeland through Russia on the condition that we should protect their safety. We have now reached a full understanding on this matter with Professor Max, the President of the Czecho-Slovak National Council in Russia. He has returned to Bohemia in order to communicate our proposition to the Bohemian Government.

Finally, Senator Hitchcock maintains that one reason for the invasion was to prevent the formation of any army composed of German and Austrian prisoners. The only now existing obstacle to the return of all war prisoners to their homelands is the presence of the Allied troops, or White Guards who are under the protection of the Allied troops. We therefore cannot understand why this should be a cause for a further maintenance of American troops in Russia.

Judging from statements contained in the above-mentioned radio telegram, some prominent members of the principal political party in the United States could not quite understand the reasons of Senator Hitchcock. They expressed their wish that American troops in Russia should be withdrawn as soon as possible. We share their wish to reëstablish normal relations between the two countries, and we are ready to eliminate everything which may be an obstacle to such relations.

This is not the first time we are making an offer of this kind. In October we sent an offer of this character through the Norwegian Minister in Russia. A week later we made a similar offer through Mr. Christiansen, an attaché of the Norwegian Legation, at the time of his leaving Moscow. On the 3d of November we invited the representatives of the neutral countries in Moscow and asked them to deliver a written proposition to the Allies, with the view to entering into negotiations which would put an end to the struggles against Russia. On the 26th of November the All-Russian Congress of Soviets declared to the Allies, and to the whole world, that Russia was willing to enter into peace negotiations. On the 23d of December our representative, M. Litvinov, communicated once more with the Allied Ambassadors in Stockholm the desire of the Russian Government to reach a friendly settlement of all questions at issue. He also sent an appeal to President Wilson in London; thus the responsibility for the fact that no agreement has been thus far reached does not lie with us.

We have had an opportunity to hear various American officers and soldiers express their astonishment at their being held in Russia, especially when we pointed out to such soldiers that the reason for their being in Russia seemed to be to put back on the shoulders of the Russian people the yoke which they have thrown off. The results of these explanations of ours have not been unsatisfactory to our personal relations with these American citizens.

We hope that the desire for peace expressed by the above-mentioned Senator is shared by the entire American Government and that the American Government will kindly name a place and a time for opening of peace negotiations with our representatives.

CHICHERIN
*People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs*
By MAXIM LITVINOV
*Representative of the Russian Government in Stockholm*

## 12 NOTE IN REPLY TO PRINKIPO INVITATION

*To the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States of North America:* The Russian Soviet Government has learned, through a radiogram which contained a review of the press, of an invitation stated to have been addressed by the Entente Powers to all *de facto* Governments of Russia, to send delegates to a conference on Princes Island.

As the Soviet Government of Russia has received no such invitation addressed to it, but has learned—and again through a radio review of the press—that the absence of an answer from the Soviet Government is interpreted as a refusal to reply to this invitation, the Russian Soviet Government desires to remove any false interpretation of its actions. On the other hand, in view of the fact that the foreign press systematically reports its actions in a false light, the Russian Soviet Government takes advantage of this opportunity to express its attitude with the utmost clearness and frankness.

In spite of the fact that both the military and internal conditions of Soviet Russia are constantly improving, the Soviet Government is so anxious to secure an agreement that would put an end to hostilities, that it is ready to enter at once into negotiations to this end, and, as it has more than once declared, is even willing in order to obtain such an agreement to make serious concessions, provided they will not menace the future development of Soviet Russia. In view of the fact that the power of resistance of the enemies which Soviet Russia has to fight depends exclusively on the aid which they receive from the Entente Powers, and that these are, therefore, its only real adversaries, the Russian Soviet Government addresses to these Powers a statement with regard to those questions on which it would consider such concessions possible in order to put an end to all conflicts with these Powers.

In view of the particular importance which is attached not only by the press, but also by the numerous declarations of the representatives of the Entente Governments to the question of Russian loans, the Soviet Government first of all declares its readiness to make concessions in this matter to the demands of the Entente Powers. It does not refuse to recognize its financial obligations to its creditors who are subjects of the Entente Powers, leaving the precise formulation of the manner in which this point is to be enforced to the special treaties the elaboration of which is to be one of the tasks of the proposed negotiations.

Secondly, in view of the difficult financial position of the Russian Soviet Republic and the unsatisfactory condition of its credit abroad, the Russian Soviet Government offers to guarantee the payment of interest on its loans by a certain amount of raw materials, which should be determined through a special agreement.

Thirdly, in view of the great interest which foreign capital has always evinced toward the question of the exploitation in its interests of the natural resources of Russia, the Soviet Government is willing to grant to subjects of the Entente Powers concessions in mines, forests, and other resources, which must

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be carefully formulated in such manner that the economic and social order of Soviet Russia shall be in no way violated by the internal regulations of these concessions.

The fourth point which, in the opinion of the Russian Soviet Government, might be dealt with in the proposed negotiations is the question of territorial concessions, for the Soviet Government does not intend to insist on excluding from these negotiations the consideration of the question of annexation of Russian territories by the Entente Powers. The Soviet Government adds that the presence in the territory of the former Russian Empire, with the exception of Poland and Finland, of armed forces of the Entente or of forces which are maintained at the expense of the Governments of the Entente or receive financial, technical, military, or any other kind of support from them, should also be characterized as annexation.

As for points two and four, the scope of the concessions to which the Soviet Government will agree will depend on its military situation with regard to the Entente Powers, and this situation is at present constantly improving.

On the northern front the Soviet troops have just retaken the city of Shenkursk. On the eastern front they have temporarily lost Perm, but they have regained Ufa, Sterlitamak, Belebey, Orenburg, and Uralsk. As a result of this the railroad connection with Central Asia is at present in the hands of the Soviet Government. On the southern front they have recently taken the important railroad stations of Pavorino, Alexikovo, Uriupino, Talovaya, Kalatsh, and Begutchar, and thus control the railroads of this region, while the Ukrainian Soviet troops, advancing from Lugansk, threaten Krasnov's rear from the southeast. Local Soviet troops have taken Kharkov, Ekaterinoslav, Poltava, Kremenchug, Chernigov, Ovruch, and many other less important cities. White Russia, Lithuania, and Lettonia are almost entirely in the hands of the Soviet troops of these republics, including the large cities of Minsk, Vilna, Riga, Dvinsk, Mitau, Vindau, and others.

The remarkable improvement in the internal situation of Soviet Russia appears from the negotiations which the members of the former Constituent Assembly have begun with the Soviet Government. Their representatives, Rakitnikov (President of their Congress), Sviatizki (Secretary), Volski, Shmelev, Courevoy, Chernenkov, Antonov, all of whom are members of the Central Committee of the Social Revolutionary party, arrived in Moscow yesterday, February 3. These well-known Social Revolutionists have declared themselves with great emphasis against the Entente intervention in Russia.

The improvement of the Soviet Government's relations with the elements formerly hostile to it in Russian society is indicated by the change of the attitude of the Mensheviki, whose conference has likewise protested against the Entente intervention and whose organ, *Vpered*, appears in Moscow without interference. The general easing up of the former tension in the internal situation of Russia is shown by the abolition of the Local Extraordinary Commissions (for combating counter-revolution). And finally, the reports in the foreign press concerning the alleged unrest in Petrograd and other places are absolutely fabrications.

Emphasizing again that the situation of the Soviet Republic will necessarily affect the extent of the proposed concession, the Russian Soviet Government, nevertheless, stands by its proposal to enter into negotiations on the above-mentioned questions. As for the complaints frequently expressed in the Entente press with regard to the international revolutionary propaganda of the Russian Soviet Government, that Government declares that it is ready, if necessary, to include in the general agreement with the Entente Powers the obligation not to interfere in their internal affairs, pointing out, however, that it cannot limit the freedom of the revolutionary press.

On the above-mentioned basis the Russian Soviet Government is ready to enter into immediate negotiations on Princes Island or at any other place with all the Entente Powers or with individual Powers of their number or with certain Russian political groups, according to the wish of the Entente Powers. The Russian Soviet Government requests the Entente Powers to make known to it without delay the place to which it should send its representatives, as well as the time and the route.

CHICHERIN
*People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs*

*Moscow, February 4, 1919*

## 13 Extracts from Note to Italian Government

. . . Soviet Russia demands but one thing: that she be permitted to live in peace. She does not menace anybody, she has always sought the friendship of all peoples. The invasion of her territory by the Allied armies was provoked by no act on her part. Since then the Soviet Government has repeated many times its peace proposals to the representatives of the Entente through the neutral representatives in Moscow. The proposition to enter into peace parleys was addressed on November 3 to the Italian Government at the same time as to the other Entente Governments. On November 8, the 5th Congress of Soviets declared solemnly before the whole world that it had addressed to the Entente Powers a proposition to enter into negotiations to put an end to the armed conflict with those Powers. The same proposition was addressed on December 23, by the Russian representative at Stockholm, Litvinov, to the representatives of the Entente countries resident in Sweden. Lastly, on February 4, in the note sent out by wireless to the Entente Governments, the Russian Soviet Government declared itself ready to make serious sacrifices with regard to its financial obligations, and also to furnish guarantees in the form of quantities of raw materials, as well as mining, forest, and other concessions, and also some concessions in the sphere of territorial annexations. While these lines are being written, the Russian Soviet Government is still awaiting an answer from the Entente Governments. We repeat once more that peace and friendship with all peoples is the aim which Soviet Russia seeks to attain even at the price of serious sacrifices. . . . But still now as before our constant desire is peace with all peoples. In order to be able to enjoy its benefits we are now as ever ready to make serious sacrifices, which are mentioned in our note of February 4, addressed to the Powers of the Entente. We propose real advantages to the commerce and industry of the Western countries; we declare to the latter that their real interests will be served by the conditions which we propose. We believe that they ought for their own interest to consent to this and reëstablish normal relations with us, so ardently desired by us. We hope that Italy, finally, which would seem to have no cause for hostility to Soviet Russia, will terminate its policy directed against us and will use its influence in the international deliberations of the Powers in order to aid us in the reëstablishment of normal and peaceful relations with all the peoples and their Governments, which is the object of our desires. What we wish is peace and we hope that the Entente Powers will at last accede to our desire.

## 14 Note Regarding Poland

*To the Governments of England, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States of North America:* The Government of the Russian Soviet Republic, which has already expressed in its note of February 4, addressed to the Governments of the Allied Powers, its efforts to attain peace, as well as its definite desire for peace, has toward the Government of the Polish Republic an attitude which is just as peace-loving as is its attitude toward the Soviet Republics of Lithuania and White Russia, with which it now stands in a relation of mutual friendliness. The Government of the Polish Republic in its behalf proposed, in a note dated February 7, and addressed to the Russian Soviet Government, a special delegate commissioned to open peace negotiations. In its note of February 10, the Russian Soviet Government informed the Government of the Polish Republic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that it would receive the latter's delegate, since the Soviet Government ardently desires to remove all grounds of conflict with the Polish Republic and to bring about normal communications between the two republics. In the matter of territorial questions which require deliberations between representatives of the Republics of Lithuania and White Russia, the Russian Soviet Government states its readiness to offer to the Polish Government its coöperation toward a peaceful solution of these questions. The Governments of Lithuania and White Russia have in turn sent a radio telegram to the Polish Government, containing a protest against the attempts made by the latter to settle disputed questions of territory by force of arms, in so far as they concern Lithuania and White Russia, and have proposed to the Polish Government the formation of a mixed commission to determine the political boundaries between Lithuania and White Russia on the one side and the Polish Republic on the other side.

In spite of this unmistakable indication of the peaceful inclinations of the Soviet Republic of Russia, as well as of the Soviet Republics of Lithuania and White Russia, the Polish troops nevertheless persist in their attempts to invade these regions, and continued concentrations of the armed forces of the Polish Republic, on its eastern boundaries, are still in progress, threatening both the Soviet Republics of Lithuania and White Russia, as well as the Russian Soviet Republic, which is united with them in immutable friendship. This movement of the Polish troops is undertaken at the very moment when extraordinary representatives of the Entente Powers have arrived at Warsaw. In this connection, the Russian Government cannot refrain from calling attention to the wireless messages issued by the official wireless stations of various countries, reporting on the demands of the Entente Powers, addressed to Germany, to grant free passage over German territory for Polish troops to be used against the Bolsheviki, i. e., against the Soviet Republics which are situated within the confines of the former Russian Empire.

The attitude assumed by the Entente Powers is all the more incomprehensible in view of the proposal made by them to the Russian Soviet Government as well as to all other Governments actually existing within the confines of the former Russian Empire, with the purpose of taking up peace negotiations, and also in view of the peace proposals advanced by the Russian Soviet Government.

Without doubt, the Governments of the Entente Powers will recognize the necessity of making some declaration with regard to the attitude assumed by them in the matter of the relations between the Polish Republic and the Soviet Governments; the Russian Soviet Government nevertheless emphasizes that in its communication it is animated by peaceful intentions and by its desire to eliminate all grounds of conflict with the Entente Powers and with the Polish Republic, of which desire it has already given full expression in the preceding communication of the Russian Soviet Government.

CHICHERIN
*People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs*

## 15 Proposals Transmitted by Bullitt

The Allied and Associated Governments to propose that hostilities shall cease on all fronts in the territory of the former Russian Empire and Finland on——, and that no new hostilities shall begin after this date, pending a conference to be held at——on——.

The duration of armistice to be for two weeks, unless extended by mutual consent, and all parties to the armistice to undertake not to employ the period of the armistice to transfer troops and war material to the territory of the former Russian Empire.

The conference to discuss peace on the basis of the following principles, which shall not be subject to revision by the conference.

1. All the existing *de facto* Governments which have been set up on the territory of the former Russian Empire and Finland to remain in full control of the territories which they occupy at the moment when the armistice becomes effective, except in so far as the conference may agree upon the transfer of territories, until the peoples inhabiting the territories controlled by these *de facto* Governments shall themselves determine to change their Governments. The Russian Soviet Government, the other Soviet Governments and all other Governments which have been set up on the territory of the former Russian Empire, the Allied and Associated Governments and the other Governments which are operating against the Soviet Governments, including Finland, Poland, Galicia, Rumania, Armenia, Azerbaidjan, and Afghanistan, to agree not to attempt to upset by force the existing *de facto* Governments which have been set up on the territory of the former Russian Empire and the other Governments signatory to this agreement.

2. The economic blockade to be raised and trade relations between Soviet Russia and the Allied and Associated countries to be reëstablished under conditions which shall ensure that supplies from the Allied and Associated countries are made available on equal terms to all classes of the Russian people.

3. The Soviet Governments of Russia to have the right of unhindered transit on all railroads and the use of all ports which belonged to the former Russian Empire and to Finland and are necessary for the disembarkation and transportation of passengers and goods between their territories and the sea; detailed arrangements for the carrying out of this provision to be agreed upon at the conference.

4. The citizens of the Soviet Republics of Russia to have the right of free entry into the Allied and Associated countries as well as into all countries which have been formed on the territory of the former Russian Empire and Finland; also the right of sojourn and of circulation and of full security, provided they do not interfere in the domestic politics of these countries.

Nationals of the Allied and Associated countries and of the other countries above named to have the right of free entry into the Soviet Republics of Russia; also the right of sojourn and of circulation and full security, provided they do not interfere in the domestic politics of the Soviet Republics.

The Allied and Associated Governments and other Governments which have been set up on the territory of the former Russian Empire and Finland to have the right to send official representatives enjoying full liberty and immunity into the various Russian Soviet Republics. The Soviet Governments of Russia to have the right to send official representatives enjoying full liberty and immunity into all the Allied and Associated countries and into the non-Soviet countries which have been formed on the territory of the former Russian Empire and Finland.

5. The Soviet Governments, the other Governments which have been set up on the territory of the former Russian Empire and Finland, to give a general amnesty to all political opponents, offenders, and prisoners. The Allied and Associated Governments to give a general amnesty to all Russian political opponents, offenders, and prisoners, and to their own nationals who have been or may be prosecuted for giving help to Soviet Russia. All Russians who have fought in, or otherwise aided the armies opposed to the Soviet Governments, and those opposed to other Governments which have been set up on the territory of the former Russian Empire and Finland to be included in this amnesty.

All prisoners of war of non-Russian Powers detained in Russia, likewise all nationals of these Powers now in Russia to be given full facilities for repatriation. The Russian prisoners of war in whatever foreign country they may be, likewise all Russian nationals, including the Russian soldiers and officers abroad and those serving in all foreign armies to be given full facilities for repatriation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

6. Immediately after the signing of this agreement all troops of the Allied and Associated Governments and other non-Russian Governments to be withdrawn from Russia, and military assistance to cease to be given to anti-Soviet Governments which have been set up on the territory of the former Russian Empire.

The Soviet Governments and the anti-Soviet Governments which have been set up on the territory of the former Russian Empire and Finland to begin to reduce their armies simultaneously, and at the same rate, to a peace footing immediately after the signing of this agreement. The conference to determine the most effective and just method of inspecting and controlling this simultaneous demobilization and also the withdrawal of the troops and the cessation of the military assistance to the anti-Soviet Governments.

7. The Allied and Associated Governments, taking cognizance of the statement of the Soviet Government of Russia, in its note of February 4, in regard to its foreign debts, propose as an integral part of this agreement that the Soviet Governments and other Governments which have been set up on the territory of the former Russian Empire and Finland shall recognize their responsibility for the financial obligations of the former Russian Empire, to foreign states parties to this agreement, and to the nationals of such states. Detailed agreements for the payment of these debts to be agreed upon at the conference, regard being had to the present financial position of Russia. The Russian gold seized by the Czecho-Slovaks in Kazan or taken from Germany by the Allies to be regarded as partial payment of the portion of the debt due from the Soviet Republics of Russia.

The Soviet Government of Russia undertakes to accept the foregoing proposal provided it is made not later than April 10, 1919.

## 21 Resolution of Congress of Soviets

The Russian Socialist Federative Republic of Soviets desires to live at peace with all peoples, and to devote all its strength to internal constructive work, in order to perfect the production, transport, and public administration on the basis of a Soviet régime, to the work which has hitherto been hindered by the pressure of German imperialism and subsequently by the Entente intervention and the starvation blockade.

The Government of Workers and Peasants has many times proposed peace to the Entente Powers, notably on August 5, 1918, by means of a letter from the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs to the American Consul, Mr. Poole; on October 24 by a note to President Wilson; on November 3 to all the Entente Governments, by the intermediary of representatives of neutral countries; on November 7 in the name of the Sixth Congress of Soviets; on December 23 by a circular note addressed by Citizen Litvinov to the Entente representatives in Sweden, and subsequently by wireless messages on January 12 and 17, 1919; by a note to the Entente Governments on February 24; by a draft agreement drawn up on March 12 with Mr. Bullitt, President Wilson's delegate; and by a declaration made on May 7 by the intermediary of Mr. Nansen.

Completely approving these repeated steps, which have been taken by the Central Executive Committee, by the Council of People's Commissars, and by the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, the Seventh Congress of Soviets once again confirms its unchanging desire for peace by proposing once more to all the Entente Powers—to Great Britain, France, the United States of America, Italy, and Japan, to all together and to each separately—immediately to commence peace negotiations, and charges the Executive Committee, the Council of People's Commissars, and the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs systematically to continue this peace policy, taking all necessary measures for its success.

Kalinin, *President*
Avanessov, *Secretary*

# Books of the Week

### RECONSTRUCTION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Clopper, Edward N. (director). Child Welfare in Kentucky. National Child Labor Committee. $1.25.—Foerster, Robert F. The Italian Emigration of Our Times. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. $2.50.—Maranelli, C., and Salvemini, G. La Questione dell' Adriatico. Roma: Liberia della Voce.—Saleeby, C. W. The Whole Armour of Man. Lippincott. $2.50.—Secerov, Slavko. Economic Phenomena Before and After War. London: Routledge & Sons. $5.—Smith, J. Russell. The World's Food Resources. Holt. $3.50.

### ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Bates, Katharine Lee. Sigurd Our Golden Collie. Dutton. $2.—Cram, Ralph Adams. Gold, Frankincense, and Myrrh. Marshall Jones Co. $1.25.—Fabre, J. Henri. The Glow-Worm. Translated by Alexander Teixeira de Mattos. Dodd, Mead. $1.75.—Gass, Sherlock Bronson. A Lover of the Chair. Marshall Jones Co. $2.50.—Smith, Logan Pearsall. Donne's Sermons: Selected Passages. Clarendon Press.—Stoll, Elmer Edgar. Hamlet: An Historical and Comparative Study. University of Minnesota.

### HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Gardner, Monica M. The Anonymous Poet of Poland: Zygmunt Krasinski. Cambridge University Press.—Glenconner, Pamela. Edward Wyndham Tenant: A Memoir. Lane. $5.—Hornblow, Arthur. A History of the Theatre in America. Volumes 1 and 2. Lippincott. $10.— Paton, Lucy Allen. Elizabeth Cary Agassiz: A Biography. Houghton Mifflin. $3.—Sproxton, Charles. Palmerston and the Hungarian Revolution. Cambridge University Press.—Tirpitz, Grand Admiral von. My Memoirs. Volumes 1 and 2. Dodd, Mead. $7.50.—Watterson, Henry. "Marse Henry": An Autobiography. Volumes 1 and 2. Doran. $10.

### POETRY AND DRAMA

Cabot, Elise Pumpelly. Arizona and Other Poems. Dutton. $2.—Coles, Rutgers Remsen. Rapids and Still Water. Stratford Co. $1.—Davidson, Gustav. Songs of Adoration. The Madrigal. $1.30.—de Acosta, Mercedes. Moods. Moffat, Yard. $1.25.—Enlow, Lucile C. The Heart of a Girl. Stratford Co. $1.—Smith, L. Worthington. The Lamp of Heaven. Four Seas.—Yanks: A. E. F. Verse. Putnams. $2.

### FICTION

Locke. Gladys Edson. Ronald o' the Moors. Four Seas. $1.75.—Meigs, Cornelia. The Pool of Stars. Macmillan. $1.60—Merrick, Leonard. The Man Who Understood Women. Dutton. $1.75.—Meynell, Viola. Modern Lovers. Four Seas. $1.60.—Ostrander, Isabel. Ashes to Ashes. McBride. $1.65.—Swift, Jonathan. Gulliver's Travels; The Tale of a Tub; and The Battle of the Books. Oxford University Press.

### PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Cory, Herbert Ellsworth. The Intellectuals and the Wage Workers. The Sunwise Turn.—Hadley, Arthur Twining. The Moral Basis of Democracy. Yale University Press. $1.75.—Hollander, Jacob H. American Citizenship and Economic Welfare. Johns Hopkins Press. $1.25.—Report of the Governor of Porto Rico to the Secretary of War, 1919. Washington: Government Printing Office.

### JUVENILE

Franchi, Anna. The Little Lead Soldier. Philadelphia: Penn Publishing Co. $1.50.—Hare, J. Truxton, Kent of Malvern. Philadelphia: Penn Publishing Co. $1.50.—Heyliger, William.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

High Benton. Appleton. $1.50.—Lippincott, Joseph Wharton. Red Ben, the Fox of Oak Ridge. Philadelphia: Penn Publishing Co. $1.—Olcott, Frances Jenkins. The Wonder Garden. Houghton Mifflin. $2.50.—Sheppard, Crispin. Don Hale with the Flying Squadron. Philadelphia: Penn Publishing Co., 75 cents.

Colum, Padraic. The Girl Who Sat by the Ashes. Macmillan. $2.—Ford, Julia Ellsworth. Snickerty Nick. Moffat, Yard. $1.75.—Wells, Carolyn. Everychild's Mother Goose. Macmillan. $2.

### EDUCATION AND TEXT BOOKS

Durell, Fletcher and E. E. Arnold. A First Book in Algebra. Merrill Co.—Dyer, Franklin B. and Mary J. Brady. Readings in Literature, Book Two. Merrill Co.—Shipley, Arthur Everett. The Voyage of a Vice-Chancellor. Putnams.

### THE WAR

Conkley, T. F. The Fifth Station. Pittsburgh: Catholic Trust Society. $1.—Palmer, Frederick. Our Greatest Battle. Dodd, Mead. $2.50.—Réquin, Lieut. Col. E. America's Race to Victory. Stokes. $2.50.—Usher, Roland G. The Story of the Great War. Macmillan. $2.50.

### PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Doyle, Arthur Conan. The Vital Message. Doran.—Faville, John. I Believe in God the Father. Stratford Co. $1.25.—Jackson, Henry E. A Community Church. Houghton Mifflin. $2.—Ryan, John A. The Church and Socialism. Washington: The University Press.—The Living Church Annual and Churchman's Almanac, 1920. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co.—Wilson, Philip Whitwell. The Church We Forget. Revell. $2.

### LABOR, INDUSTRY AND TRADE

Frederick, J. George. Modern Sales Management. Appleton. $2.50.—Phelan, J. J. Motion Pictures as a Phase of Commercialized Amusement. Ohio: Little Book Press.

### SCIENCE

Hopkins, Nevil Monroe. The Outlook for Research and Invention. Van Nostrand Co. $2.

### NATURE AND OUTDOOR LIFE

Cook, Sir Theodore A. Henley Races. Oxford University Press.—Cook, Sir Theodore A. Rowing at Henley. Oxford University Press.

### MUSIC, ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY

Chapman, Clifford C. (compiler). Twenty Sacred Two-Part Songs for Women's Voices. Charles H. Ditson & Co.—Collection of Mediæval and Renaissance Painting. Fogg Art Museum. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.—Giddings, T. P. and Wilma A. Gilman. Giddings' Public School Class Method for the Piano. Charles H. Ditson & Co.—Indian Notes and Monographs. Vol. I, Nos. 1 and 2; Vol. II, Nos. 1 and 2; Vol. V, No. 1; Vol. VI, Nos. 1 and 2. Museum of the American Indian: Heye Foundation.—Krehbiel, Henry Edward. A Book of Operas. New edition. Macmillan. $2.50.—Krehbiel, Henry Edward. More Chapters of Opera. Holt. $3.50.—Newman, Ernest. A Musical Motley. Lane. $1.50.—Saar, Louis Victor. Twelve Sacred Trios for Women's Voices. Charles H. Ditson & Co. 50 cents.

### MISCELLANEOUS

Herford, Oliver (editor). This Giddy Globe. Doran.—Lazar, Maurice. The Late Mr. Katterby. Chicago: Walter M. Hill.


# The New School for Social Research

offers courses for

Business and Professional Men and Women, Trade Unionists, Students, and Teachers

Law Reform, *by Roscoe Pound, Felix Frankfurter, and others.*

Income and Excess-Profits Taxes, *by T. S. Adams.*

Corporation Finance. Business Cycles.

Statistics. Trade-Union Policies.

Reconstruction Problems.

Problems of American Government.

Current Political Thinking.

Religion in Social Progress.

Social Function of the Engineer, *by Gu do H. Marx.*

SECOND TERM BEGINS FEBRUARY NINTH

*For catalogue apply to the school*

465 West 23rd Street Chelsea 1386



# THE FLOW OF VALUE

**By Logan Grant McPherson**

**Author of "How the World Makes Its Living," etc.**

**CIVILIZATION means living together and working together. Economic activity consists in the application of human effort in meeting human wants. This has given rise to production, buying and selling, to the supply of and the demand for things and services which meet human wants. Value, capital, prices, wages, profit and interest are the outgrowth of production, buying and selling; as also is the relation between the employer and employee. This book sets forth, in the light of their evolution, the significance of these various phases of economic activity, and the principles which must be recognized in serving the greatest good of the greatest number.**

***Price $2.50***

**At all Bookstores**

**Published by THE CENTURY CO. New York City**


LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED